DUKE
UNIVERSITY

DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Duke University Libraries

https://archive.org/details/finalappealtochr01ramm

AN APPEAL

TO

THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC,

IN DEFENCE OF THE

"PRECEPTS OF JESUS."

Ramamohana Rays

BY

A FRIEND TO TRUTH.

PRINTED AT CALCUTTA:

1820.

DIV.S
232.9
R165A

AN APPEAL,

&c. &c.

IN perusing the twentieth number of "The Friend of India," I felt as much surprized as disappointed at some remarks made in that magazine by a gentleman under the signature of "A Christian Missionary," on a late publication intitled, "The Precepts of Jesus;" and also at some observations of a similar nature on the same subject by the Editor of that publication. Before however I attempt to enquire into the ground upon which their objections to the work in question are founded, I humbly beg to appeal to the public against the unchristianlike, as well as uncivil manner in which the Editor has adduced his objections to the compilation, by introducing personality, and applying the term of *heathen* to the Compiler. I say unchristianlike manner, be-

cause the Editor, by making use of the term heathen, has, I presume, violated truth, charity, and liberality, which are essential to Christianity in every sense of the word. For there are only two methods by which the character of the Compiler as a heathen, or as a believer in one true and living God, can be satisfactorily inferred. The most reasonable of the two modes is to confine such enquiries to the evidence contained in the subject of review, no mention of the name of the Compiler being made in the publication itself. Another mode, which is obviously inapplicable in such discussions, is to guess at the real author, and to infer his opinions from a knowledge of his education or other circumstances. With respect to the first source of evidence, the following expressions of the Compiler's sentiments are found in the Introduction. "A notion of the existence of a supreme superintending power, the author and preserver of the harmonious system, who has organized and who regulates such an infinity of celestial and terrestrial objects, and a due estimation of that Law which teaches that man should do to others as he would wish to be done by, reconcile us to human nature, &c." "This simple code of religion and morality (meaning the Precepts of Jesus), is so admirably calculated to elevate men's ideas to high and liberal notions of one God, &c." "so well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in the discharge of their various duties to God, to themselves, and to society," and "so con-

formable to the dictates of human reason and divine revelation, &c." These expressions are calculated, in my humble opinion, to convince every mind not biassed by prejudice, that the Compiler believed not only in one God, whose nature and essence is beyond human comprehension, but in the truths revealed in the Christian system. I should hope neither the Reviewer nor the Editor can be justified in inferring the heathenism of the Compiler, from the facts of his extracting and publishing the moral doctrines of the New Testament, under the title of "A Guide to peace and happiness"—his styling the Precepts of Jesus, a code of religion and morality—his believing God to be the author and preserver of the universe—or his considering those sayings as adapted to regulate the conduct of the whole human race in the discharge of all the duties required of them.

Neither, I trust, can his separating the moral sayings of Christ from the mysterious dogmas and historical parts of the New Testament, under the impression, that these are liable to the doubts and disputes of freethinkers and antichristians, with which this part of the world is unfortunately filled; nor his opinion that this simple code of morality would be more likely to attract the notice and respect of such men, and to guide their minds into the paths of peace and happiness, than if presented to them in conjunction with other matter against which

their education has taught them to revolt; justly subject him, in the opinion of the most orthodox Christians, to the epithet applied to him by the Editor. If they do, I cannot see how the same condemnation can be spared to numerous publications of extracts from the Old and the New Testaments, made and sent forth by several Christian authors, under various designations and for different purposes.

With respect to the latter mode of seeking evidence, however unjustified the Editor may be in coming to such a conclusion, he is safe in ascribing the collection of these Precepts to Rammohun Roy; who, although he was born a Brahmun, not only renounced idolatry at a very early period of his life, but published at that time a treatise in Arabic and Persian against that system; and no sooner acquired a tolerable knowledge of English, than he made his desertion of idol worship known to the Christian world by his English publication—a renunciation that, I am sorry to say, brought severe difficulties upon him, by exciting the displeasure of his parents, and subjecting him to the dislike of his near, as well as distant relations, and to the hatred of nearly all his countrymen for several years. I therefore presume that among his declared enemies, who are aware of those facts, no one who has the least pretension to truth, would venture to apply the designation of heathen to him; but I am sure,

that the respect he entertains for the very name of Christianity, which the Editor of the Friend of India seems to profess, will restrain him from retorting on that Editor, although there may be differences of opinion between them, that might be thought sufficient to justify the use towards the Editor of a term no less offensive.—The Editor perhaps may consider himself justified by numerous precedents amongst the several partizans of different Christian sects, in applying the name of Heathen to one who takes the Precepts of Jesus as his principal guide in matters of religious and civil duties; as Roman Catholics bestow the appellation of heretics or infidels on all classes of Protestants, and Protestants do not spare the title of Idolators to Roman Catholics; Trinitarians deny the name of Christian to Unitarians, while the latter retort by stigmatising the worshippers of the Son of man as Pagans, who adore a created and dependent Being. Very different conduct is inculcated in the precept of Jesus to John, when complaining of one who performed cures in the name of Jesus, yet refused to follow the Apostles:—he gave a rebuke, saying, "He that is not against us is on our part." *Mark, ch.* ix. *v.* 40. The Compiler, having obviously in view at least one object in common with the Reviewer and Editor, that of procuring respect for the precepts of Christ, might have reasonably expected more charity from professed teachers of his doctrines.

The Compiler of the Precepts of Jesus, will, however, I doubt not, give preference to the guidance of those Precepts, which justify no retaliation even upon enemies, to the hasty suggestions of human passions, and the example of the Editor of the Friend of India.

2.—The Editor of the Friend of India and the respected Reviewer, both not only disapprove absolutely the plan adopted by the Compiler in separating the moral doctrines of the Books of the New Testament ascribed to the four Evangelists from the mysteries and historical matters therein contained, but even blame him as an injurer of the cause of truth; and for such disapprobation they assign several reasons:—first, The Reviewer says, the suppsition of the moral sayings being sufficient for salvation, independent of the dogmas, is, (as he notes in page 27,) radically false; and that it is presumption of him (the Compiler) to think himself qualified to judge, independently of the Divine Teacher, what sort of instruction is advantageous for the happiness of mankind.—If indeed the Reviewer understands by the word *moral*, what relates to conduct only with reference to man, it cannot apply to those precepts of Jesus, that teach the duty of man to God; which however the Reviewer will find included in the collection of the Precepts of Jesus by the Compiler: but a slight attention to the scope of the Introduction might

have convinced the Reviewer, that the sense in which the word *moral* is there used, whether rightly or otherwise, is quite general, and applies equally to our conduct in religious as in civil matters. Without attaching this meaning to the term moral doctrines, the whole of the concluding sentence, (see page 4,) must appear absurd, where it is said, " This simple code is well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in the discharge of their various duties to God, to themselves, and to society." This assertion is corroborated and supported by a great number of passages in the treatise in question, which point out the appropriate mode of performing our duty to the Almighty Power.—It is however too true to be denied, that the Compiler of those moral precepts separated them from some of the dogmas and other matters, chiefly under the supposition, that they alone were a sufficient guide to secure peace and happiness to mankind at large—a position that is entirely founded on and supported by the express authorities of Jesus of Nazareth—a denial of which would imply a total disavowal of Christianity. Some of those authorities, as found amongst these precepts, here follow: *Matthew, Chap.* xxii. beginning with *ver.* 37. " Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. 38. This is the first and great commandment. 39. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 40. On

THESE TWO COMMANDMENTS HANG ALL THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS." *Mark, Chap.* xii. beginning with v. 29. " And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, The Lord our God is one Lord. 30. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment. 31. And the second is LIKE, namely this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself:—there is no other commandment greater than these. 32. And he said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth; for there is one God, and there is none other but he. 33. And to love him with all the heart, with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all burnt-offerings and sacrifices. 34. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." *Matthew, Chap.* vii. *verse* 12. "Therefore all things whatever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to men; FOR THIS IS THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS. *Chap.* v.—Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or Prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." *Luke, Chap.* x. beginning with *verse* 25. "And behold, a certain Lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? 26. He said unto him, What is written in the Law? How readest thou? 27. He answering said: Thou shalt

Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself. 28. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right. THIS DO and THOU SHALT LIVE." The Saviour meant of course by the words *Law* and *Prophets*, all the commandments ordained by divine authority, and the Religion revealed to the Prophets and observed by them; as is evident from Jesus's declaring those commandments to afford perfect means of acquiring eternal life, and directing men to follow them accordingly. Had any other doctrine been requisite to teach men the road to peace and happiness, Jesus could not have pronounced to the Lawyer, "This do and THOU SHALT LIVE." It was the characteristic of the office of Christ to teach men, that forms and ceremonies were useless tokens of respect for God, compared with the essential proof of obedience and love towards him evinced by the practice of beneficence towards their fellow creatures. The Compiler, finding these commandments given as including all the revealed Law and the whole system of religion adopted by the Prophets and re-established and fulfilled by Jesus himself, as the means to acquire Peace and Happiness, was desirous of giving more full publicity in this country to them, and to the subsidiary moral doctrines that are introduced by the Saviour in detail. Placing also implicit confidence in the truth of his sacred commandments, to the observance of which we are directed by the same

teacher, (*John, Chap.* xiv. *verse* 16. " If ye love me, keep my commandments." *Verse* 24. "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings,") the Compiler never hesitated in declaring *(page* 1.*)*, " a belief in God and a due regard to that Law, ' Do unto others as you would wish to be done by,' render our existence agreeable to ourselves and profitable to the rest of mankind." It may now be left to the public to judge, whether or not the charge of arrogance and presumption which the Reviewer has imputed to the Compiler, under the idea that he preferred his own judgment to that of the Saviour, be justly applicable to him.

3.—The respected Reviewer argues in *page* 26, that there are two important points, a knowledge of which is not to be acquired by following the moral precepts of Christ, but which are essential to the attainment of true peace of mind; they being entirely founded (as he alleges) upon the dogmas and histories, viz. how to obtain 1st, the forgiveness of sins and the favor of God; and 2dly, strength to overcome human passions, and to keep the commandments of God. These precepts separated from the mysterious dogmas and historical records, appear on the contrary to the Compiler to contain not only the essence of all that is necessary to instruct mankind in their civil duties, but also the best and only means of obtaining the forgiveness of our sins, the favor of God, and

strength to overcome our passions, and to keep his commandments. I therefore extract from the same compilation, a few passages of that greatest of all Prophets, who was sent to call sinners to repentance; a due attention to which will, I hope, satisfy the respected Reviewer on those two points. *Luke, chap.* xiii. *verse* 3. " Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish." *Chap.* xv. *verse* 7. " I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in Heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine persons who need no repentance. I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." *Matthew, Chap.* ix. " I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." *Chap.* xviii. " For the son of man is come to save that which was lost." *Luke, Chap.* vi. " I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Which sayings are confirmatory of what is taught in *Ezekiel, Chap.* xviii. *verse* 30. " Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin." See also the parable of the prodigal son, where the mercy of God is illustrated by the example of a father pardoning the transgressions of his repenting son.—Numerous passages of the Old and the New Testaments to the same effect, which might fill a volume, distinctly promise us that the forgiveness of God and the favor of his divine

majesty may be obtained by sincere repentance, as required of sinners by the Redeemer.

As to the second point, that is: How to be enabled to overcome our passions, and keep the commandments of God:—we are not left unprovided for in that respect, as our gracious Saviour has promised every strength and power as necessary consequences of earnest prayer and hearty desire. *Matthew, chap.* vii. and *Luke, Chap.* vi. " Ask and it shall be given you, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you." " If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him." *Luke, chap.* xi. " I say unto you, Ask and it shall be given you." After a due attention to these and to numerous passages of the same effect, no one who believes in the divine message of Jesus of Nazareth, or even in the truth of his doctrine only, can be at all at a loss to find adequate means of attaining those two ends, justly considered to be most essential by the Reviewer.

4.—The Reviewer imputes to the Compiler, error in exalting the value of the moral doctrines above that of the historical facts and dogmas contained in the New Testament. This imputation, I humbly maintain, can be of no weight or force

against the authority of Jesus himself, as quoted in the above texts; which clearly shew, that there is no other means of attaining eternal life except the performance of our duties towards God in obeying his commandments. That the aim and object of all the commandments of God is to teach us our duty towards our fellow-creatures may be gathered from a hundred passages of Scripture, of which perhaps the following may suffice. *Matthew, chap.* xxv. *verse* 31. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and

came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say unto them also on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." In this description of the day of judgment it is clearly announced, that the merciful father of the universe accepts as manifestation of love towards himself, every act of charity and beneficence performed towards his creatures: (see text already quoted, *Matthew, Chap.* vii. *verse* 12.) And apparently to counteract by anticipation the erroneous idea that such conduct might be dispensed with, and reliance placed on a mere dogmatical knowledge of God or of the

Saviour, the following declaration seems to have been uttered. *Matthew, Chap.* vii. *verse* 21. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord! Lord! shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my father who is in heaven. Many will say unto me in that day, Lord! Lord! have we not prophesied in thy name; in thy name have cast out devils; and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity. Therefore whosoever heareth *these sayings* of mine, and doth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock. And every one that heareth *these sayings* of mine, and doth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand." *Matthew, Chap.* xii. "Whosoever shall do the will of my father who is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother." *Luke, Chap.* ix. "My mother and my brethren are those which hear the word of God and do it." *Chap.* xi. "Blessed is the womb (said a certain woman to Jesus) that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked: but he said, Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." *John, Chap.* xv. "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my father's commandments, and abide in his love." What then are THOSE SAYINGS, the obedience to which is so

absolutely commanded as indispensible and all-sufficient to those who desire to inherit eternal life? They are no other than the blessed and benign moral doctrines taught in the sermon on the mount, (contained in the 5th, 6th, and 7th chapters of Matthew,) which include therefore every duty of man, and all that is necessary to salvation; and they expressly exclude mere profession or belief, from those circumstances which God graciously admits as giving a title to eternal happiness. Neither in this, nor in any other part of the New Testament, can we find a commandment similarly enjoining a knowledge of any of the mysteries or historical relations contained in those books. It is besides plainly stated, that but a very small portion of the works of Jesus have been handed down to us by the Evangelists. John says at the conclusion of his gospel, *Chap.* xxi. *verse* 25, "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." On the other hand we cannot doubt, that the whole spirit of his doctrines has been faithfully and fully recorded. The reason of this appears obvious:— miracles must have had a powerful effect on the minds of those who witnessed them, and who without some such evidence were disposed to question the authority of the teacher of those doctrines. *John, Chap.* xv. *v.* 23. "The works that I do in my father's name,

they bear witness of me." *v.* 37. and 38. "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works." Had his doctrines of themselves made their due impression, the aid of miracles would not have been requisite, nor had recourse to. In this country the bare report of such miracles could have given no support to the weight of the doctrines; for as the Compiler has stated in his Introduction, miracles infinitely more wonderful are related of their gods and saints, on authorities that the Hindoos must deem superior to those of the Apostles.

We are taught by revelation, as well as education, to ascribe to the Deity the perfection of those attributes which are esteemed excellent amongst mankind. And according to those ideas it must surely appear more consistent with the justice of the Sovereign Ruler, that he should admit to mercy those of his subjects who, acknowledging his authority, have endeavoured to obey his laws; or shewn contrition, when they have fallen short of their duty and love; than that he should select for favor those whose claims rest on having acquired particular ideas of his nature and of the origin of his Son, and of what afflictions that Son may have suffered in behalf of his people. If the Reviewer and Editor will continue to resist both authority and common sense, I must be content to take leave of them

with the following words, *(Luke, Chap.* xviii.) "And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

5.—The Reviewer observes (in page 24,) with every mark of disapprobation, that the Compiler has intimated in the Introduction, that the dogmatical and historical matters are rather calculated to do injury. The Compiler could not certainly overlook the daily occurrences and obvious facts which led him to remark (Introduction, page 4,) that "historical and some other passages are liable to the doubts and disputes of freethinkers and antichristians, especially miraculous relations, which are much less wonderful than the fabricated tales handed down to the natives of Asia:" and to prove what the Compiler stated, I humbly entreat any one to refer to the numerous volumes written by persons unattached to any of the established Churches against the miracles, the history, and some of the dogmas of Christianity. It has been the different interpretations of the dogmas, that have given rise to such keen disputes amongst the followers of Jesus. They have not only destroyed harmony and union between one sect of Christians and another, and continue to do so; but in past times have even caused continual wars and frequent bloodshed to rage amongst them, more dreadfully than between Christians and in-

fidels. A slight reference to the histories of Christian countries, will, I trust, afford to my readers entire conviction upon this head. Besides, the Compiler, residing in the same spot where European missionary Gentlemen and others for a period of upwards of twenty years have been, with a view to promote Christianity, distributing in vain amongst the natives numberless copies of the complete Bible, written in different languages, could not be altogether ignorant of the causes of their disappointment. He however never doubted their zeal for the promulgation of Christianity, nor the accuracy of their statement with regard to immense sums of money being annually expended in preparing vast numbers of copies of the Scriptures; but he has seen with regret, that they have completely counteracted their own benevolent efforts, by introducing all the dogmas and mysteries taught in Christian Churches to people by no means prepared to receive them; and that they have been so incautious and inconsiderate in their attempts to enlighten the natives of India, as to address their instructions to them in the same way, as if they were reasoning with persons brought up in a Christian country, with those dogmatical notions imbibed from their infancy. The consequence has been, that the natives in general, instead of benefiting by the perusal of the Bible, copies of which they always receive gratuitously, exchange them very often

for blank paper; and generally use several of the dogmatical terms in their native language as a mark of slight in an irreverent manner; the mention of which is repugnant to my feelings. Sabat, an eminently learned but grossly unprincipled Arab, whom our divines supposed that they had converted to Christianity, and whom they of course instructed in all the dogmas and doctrines, wrote a few years ago a treatise in Arabic against those very dogmas, and printed himself and published several hundred copies of this work; and another Moosulman, of the name of Ena'et Ahmud, a man of respectable family, who is still alive, speedily returned to Mohummudanism from Christianity, pleading that he had not been able to reconcile to his understanding certain dogmas which were imparted to him. It has been owing to their beginning with the introduction of mysterious dogmas, and of relations that at first sight appear incredible, that notwithstanding every exertion on the part of our divines, I am not aware that we can find a single respectable Moosulman or Hindoo, who were not in want of the common comforts of life, once glorified with the truth of Christianity, constantly adhering to it. Of the few hundred natives who have been nominally converted to Christianity, and who have been generally of the most ignorant class, there is ground to suspect that the greater number have been allured to change their faith by other attractions than by a

conviction of the truth and reasonableness of those dogmas; as we find nearly all of them are employed or fed by their spiritual teachers, and in case of neglect are apt to manifest a rebellious spirit;—a circumstance which is well known to the Compiler from several local facts, as well as from the following occurrence. About three years ago, the Compiler, on his visit to an English Gentleman, who is still residing in the vicinity of Calcutta, saw a great number of Christian Converts with a petition, which they intended to present to the highest Ecclesiastical authority, stating that their teachers, through false promises of advancement, had induced them to give up their ancient religion. The Compiler felt indignant at their presumption, and suggested to the gentleman as a friend, the propriety of not countenancing a set of men, who, from their own declaration, seemed so unprincipled. The Missionaries themselves are as well aware as the Compiler, that those very dogmas are the points which the people always select as the most proper for attack, both in their oral and written controversies with Christian teachers; all of which, if required, the Compiler is prepared to prove by the most unquestionable testimony.

Under these circumstances the Compiler published such sayings of Christ, as he thought intelligible to all, conveying conviction with them, and best

calculated to lead mankind to universal love and harmony; not dwelling upon those matters, an observance of which is not absolutely ordained, and the interpretations of which, instead of introducing peace and happiness, have generally given rise to disputes and controversies. The Compiler has had no local influence nor power to promote any one's interest, nor has he situations to give away, nor yet has he friends and colleagues to recommend others to their patronage. Humble as he is, he has therefore adopted those measures which he thought most judicious to spread the truth in an acceptable manner; but I am sorry to observe, that he has unfortunately and unexpectedly met with opposition from those whom he considered the last persons likely to oppose him on this subject. From what has already been advanced, the Reviewer may perceive the reason why the passages extracted by the Compiler from the Gospel of St. John should be comparatively few. It is from this source, that the most difficult to be comprehended of the dogmas of the Christian religion have been principally drawn; and on the foundation of passages of that writer, the interpretation of which is still a matter of keen discussion amongst the most learned and most pious Scholars in Christendom, is erected the mysterious doctrine of three Gods in one Godhead, the origin of Mohummudanism, and the stumbling-block to the conversion of the more enlightened amongst the Hindoos.

To impress more strongly on the minds of those for whom this compilation was intended, the doctrines taught by Jesus, the Compiler thought the varied repetition of them by different but concurring reporters highly advantageous, as showing clearly that those doctrines were neither misrepresented nor misconceived by any of those Evangelists.

6.—Nor is the conduct of the Compiler in selecting certain passages of the Scriptures for certain purposes singular; for we see very often extracts from the Bible, published by the learned men of every sect of Christians, with a view to the maintenance of particular doctrines. Christian Churches have selected passages from the Bible, which they conceive particularly excellent, and well adapted for the constant perusal and study of the people of their respective Churches; and besides, it is the continual practice of every Christian teacher to chuse from the whole Scriptures such texts as he deems most important, for the purposes of illustrating them, and impressing them on the minds of his hearers. Nor will those teachers, if questioned as to their object in such selection, hesitate to assign as their motive the very reason adopted by the Compiler as his—the superior importance of the parts so selected. Whether or not he has erred in his judgment on that point must be determined by those who will candidly peruse and consider the arguments already advanc-

ed on the subject, always bearing in mind the lesson practically taught by the Saviour himself, of adapting his instructions to the susceptibility and capacity of his hearers. *John* xvi. 12. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."

Hindostan is a country, of which nearly 3-5ths of the inhabitants are Hindoos, and 2-5ths Moosulmans. Although the professors of neither of these religions are possessed of such accomplishments as are enjoyed by Europeans in general, yet the latter portion are well known to be firmly devoted to a belief in one God, which has been instilled into their minds from their infancy. The former (I mean the Hindoos) are with a few exceptions immersed in gross idolatry, and in belief of the most extravagant description respecting futurity, antiquity, and the miracles of their deities and saints, as handed down to them and recorded in their ancient books. Weighing these circumstances, and anxious, from his long experience of religious controversy with natives, to avoid further disputation with them, the Compiler selected those precepts of Jesus, the obedience to which he believed most peculiarly required of a Christian, and such as could by no means tend, in doctrine, to excite the religious horror of Mohummedans or the scoffs of Hindoos. What benefit or peace of mind can we bestow upon a Moosulman, who is an entire stranger

to the Christian world, by communicating to him without preparatory instruction all the peculiar dogmas of Christianity; such as those contained in *verse* 1*st*, *chap.* 1*st*, *of St. John*, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Would they not find themselves at a loss to reconcile this dogma to their unprepared understandings, viz. A is B, and A is also with B? Although the interpretations given us of such texts by truly learned and candid divines be ever so satisfactory, yet to those that are strangers to these explanations, they cannot be intelligible; nor can it be expected from the order of things that each can happily find at hand an able interpreter, to whom he can have recourse for an explanation, whenever he may be involved in difficulties or doubts. But as a great number of Missionary Gentlemen may perhaps view the matter in a different light, and join the Editor of the Friend of India, in accusing the Compiler as an injurer of the cause of truth, I doubt not that with a view to avoid every possibility of such imputation, and to prevent others from attributing their ill success to his interference with their duties, he would gladly abstain from publishing again on the same subject, if he could see in past experience any thing to justify hopes of their success. From what I have already stated, I hope no one will infer that I feel ill-disposed towards the Missionary establishments in this country. This is

far from being the case. I pray for their augmentation, and that their members may remain in the happy enjoyment of life in a climate so generally inimical to European constitutions; for in proportion to the increase of their number, sobriety, moderation, temperance, and good behaviour, have been diffused among their neighbours as the necessary consequences of their company, conversation, and good example.

The Reviewer charges the Compiler with inconsistency, (page 27), because he has termed the precepts collected by him, a code of Religion and Morality, while, as the Reviewer supposes, they form only a code of morality and not of religion. It is already explained in paragragh 2d, that the Compiler has introduced those precepts of Jesus under the denomination of the moral sayings of the New Testament, taking the word moral in its wide sense, as including our conduct to God, to each other, and to ourselves; and to avoid the least possibility of misunderstanding the term, he has carefully particularized the sense in which he accepted that word by the latter sentence (page 4), "This simple code of Religion and Morality, (meaning by the former, those precepts which treat of our duty to God, and by the latter, such as relate to our duties to mankind and to ourselves), is so admirably calculated to elevate men's ideas to high and liberal notions of one God, &c." "and is also so well fitted

to regulate the conduct of the human race in the discharge of their various duties to God, to themselves, and to society, &c." In conformity to the design thus expressed, he has collected all the sayings that have a tendency to those ends. The Compiler however observes with regret, that neither this language nor this fact, has afforded to the Reviewer satisfactory evidence of his intention, nor sufficed to save him from the unexpected imputation of inconsisteney.

The Reviewer again (page 29) charges the Compiler with inconsistency, in having introduced some doctrinal passages into his compilation. In reply to which I again entreat the attention of the respected Reviewer to that passage in the Introduction, in which the Compiler states the motives that have led him to exclude certain parts of the Gospels from his publication. He there states, that it is on account of these passages being such as were the ordinary foundation of the arguments of the opponents of Christianity, or the sources of the interminable controversies that have led to heart-burnings and even bloodshed amongst Christians, that they were not included in his selection; and they were omitted the more readily, as he considered them not essential to religion. But such dogmas or doctrinal and other passages as are not exposed to those objections, and are not unfamiliar to the minds of those for whose benefit the compilation was in-

tended, are generally included in conformity with the avowed plan of the work—particularly such as seem calculated to direct our love and obedience to the beneficent author of the universe, and to him whom he graciously sent to deliver those Precepts of Religion and Morality, whose tendency is to promote universal peace and harmony.

8.—In objecting to the assertion made by the Compiler in the Introduction as to a belief in the existence of God prevailing generally, the respected Reviewer advances three arguments:—1st, that millions of people believe in a plurality of Gods. 2dly, that the majority of those enlightened persons who deny the truth of the Jewish and Christian Revelation are atheists. 3rdly, that the very system of the Vedant, which denies to God his moral attributes, is a refined and disguised atheism. I certainly admit that a great number of men, and even men of profound learning and extensive abilities, are, owing to their early education, literally sunk in polytheism, an absurd and irrational system of religion. But the admission of a plurality of Gods does not amount to the denial of Godhead. A man for instance cannot be accused of having no notion of mankind, because he is proved to believe in the existence of a plurality of individuals. The Reviewer ought therefore to have confined himself to the remark, the truth of which will be readily admitted, that there are

millions of people ignorant of the unity of God; the only doctrine consistent with reason and revelaton. The astonishing eagerness of the learned amongst those, whose practice and language are polytheistical, to prefer their claim to be considered as Monotheists, is a strong evidence of the consistency of the system of Monotheism with reason. Debased and despicable as is the belief of the Hindoos in three hundred and thirty millions of Gods, they pretend to reconcile this persuasion with the doctrine of the unity of God; alleging that the three hundred and thirty millions of Gods, whom they enumerate, are subordinate agents, assuming various offices in preserving the harmony of the universe under one Godhead, as innumerable rays issue from one sun. I am at a loss to trace the origin of his second argument, imputing atheism to the majority of those who deny the divinity of the Jewish and Christian Revelation. For notwithstanding my acquaintance with several Europeans and Asiatics who doubt the possibility of Revelation, I have never met with one, to the best of my recollection, maintaining atheism, however widely they might differ from the Reviewer and the Compiler in a great many points of belief relating to the Deity. The Reviewer perhaps may have met with some unhappy freethinkers, who have professed doubts respecting the existence of a supreme superintending power—a circumstance which has probably induced him to form this opi-

nion; but such rare instances can have no force to set aside the credit of what the Compiler affirms, that a belief in God *prevails generally*. Neither can I conscientiously coincide with the respected Reviewer in his imputing atheism to the Vedant system, under the supposition of its denying moral attributes to God; nor can I help lamenting that religious prejudice should influence the Reviewer so much, as to make him apply the term of atheist towards a sect or to individuals who look up to the God of nature through his wonderful works alone; for the Vedant, in common with the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, from the impossibility of forming more exalted conceptions, constantly ascribes to God the perfection of those moral attributes which are considered among the human species excellent and sublime. To prove this I quote one passage from each of the four Oopunishuds of the Vedant, which have already been translated into English. Moonduk, chap. 1, section 1. "By him who knows all things collectively and distinctly, whose knowledge and will are the only means of his actions, Bruhma, name, and form, and all that vegetates, are produced." Kuthu, chap. 5, "God is eternal, among all the perishable universe; and is the source of sensation among all animate existences; and he alone assigns to so many objects their respective purposes." Kenopunishud. "In a battle between the celestial gods

and the demons, God enabled the former to defeat the latter." And Ishopunishud, "He overspreads all creatures, is merely spirit without the form either of a minute body or of an extended one, which is liable to impression or organization. He is pure, perfect, omniscient, the Ruler of the intellect, omnipresent, and the self-existent. He has from eternity been assigning to all creatures their respective purposes." For further evidence, if required, I beg to refer the Reviewer to the rest of the original Vedant works that may be found in the College Library and in the Missionary stores of books. It is however very true, that the Vedant declares very often its total ignorance of the real nature and attributes of God. Kenopunishud, *v.*3, "Hence no vision can approach him, no language can describe him, no intellectual power can compass or determine him, we know nothing how the supreme Being should be explained, &c." It also represents God sometimes in a manner familiar to the understanding of the vulgar. Moonduk, chap. 7, section 1. "Heaven is his head, and the sun and the moon are his eyes; space is his ears, &c." But such declarations are not peculiar to the Vedant doctrines, as these are found frequently in the sacred Scriptures.—Job xxxvi. 26. "Behold God is great, and we know him not; touching the Almighty we cannot find him out, his greatness is unsearchable." The Scriptures also represent God in the same familiar and figurative manner as is found in the Vedant.

God is affirmed to have made man in his own image, after his own likeness. The angels always behold God's face in heaven. In the old Testament, as well as in the new, God is represented as repenting of his works, as being moved with anger, vexation, grief, joy, love, and hate ; as moving from place to place; having arms, with hands and fingers ; a head, with face, mouth, tongue, eyes, nose, ears, a heart, bowels, back, thighs, legs ; as seeing, being seen, speaking and hearing, slumbering, waking, &c. No one capable of sound reasoning can for a moment imagine, that these or any other descriptions of God are intended to convey literal notions of the unsearchable, incomprehensible Being.

May God render Religion destructive of differences and dislike between man and man, and conducive to the peace and union of mankind. Amen.

SECOND APPEAL

TO

THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC,

IN DEFENCE OF THE

"PRECEPTS OF JESUS."

BY

RAMMOHUN ROY.

Calcutta:

PRINTED AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS, CIRCULAR ROAD.

1821.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The contents of the following Treatise are included under these two propositions :—1st, That the Precepts of Jesus, which teach that love to God is manifested in beneficence towards our fellow-creatures, are a sufficient Guide to Peace and Happiness ; and 2ndly, That that omnipresent God, who is the only proper object of religious veneration, is one and undivided in person.

Though these doctrines, as I conceive them to be alike founded on reason and revelation, appear to me to be almost as obvious truths as any abstract axiom, yet they are opposed in fact by a very large body of writers and teachers. I must therefore leave them to be decided upon by those, who will be pleased to bestow their candid and liberal attention on the arguments I have used in the succeeding pages ;—and on their impartial judgment I confidently rely.

NOTICE.

The Reader is requested to correct the following errors, made in the copy for press by the Transcriber.

P. 7.	l. 2.	*for*	v. 16.	*read*	v. 15.
10.	15.		ix. 13.		Matt. ix. 13.
19.	12.		vi. 9.		vi. 2.
23.	15.		2 John		1 John
27.	4.		xlvii.		xlv.
46.	6.		ch. vi.		ch. v.
49.	8.		v. 66.		v. 17.
50.	27.		v. 9.		v. 29.
52.	22.		vi. 12.		Luke vi. 12.
52.	28.		xxviii.		xxvii.
53.	8.		xix. 28.		xxviii. 19.
60.	5.		x.		ix.
66.	1.		7.		17.
102.	6.		7.		vii. 56.
117	6.		xxxii. 30.		Ex. xxxii 30.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Alteration of Style in the Review, ... Page 1
Two points which the Editor wishes to establish, to wit, the excellency of the Dogmas and the insufficiency of the Precepts, ... ibid.
The Compiler acknowledges the first, ... 2
Rejects the second, ... 3
Passages shewing the sufficiency of the Precepts—God one, and the object of supreme love, ... 4
The authority of Paul quoted, inapplicable, ... ibid.
Justifying a selection as the substitute for the whole, .. 6
The Precepts of Jesus practicable, ... 7
The contradiction between the indispensibleness of the Doctrines and the sufficiency of the Precepts, ... 9
Repentance the only means of forgiveness, ... 10

CHAP. II.

Positions of the Reviewer, ... 12
Jesus receives all power from God, ... 13
Power given to Jesus as the Son of God, ... 16
The unity between God and Jesus, and between him and his disciples, ... 19
God dwelleth in Jesus and he in God, ... 20
Jesus considered distinct from God, ... 22
He that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father, .. 23
Definition of the unity between God and Jesus, .. 24

Jesus's disavowal of his own Deity, ... ibid.
The Jews charged Jesus only with calling himself the Son of God, ... 25
The term "God" frequently applied to existences inferior to God, ... 25
The term "for ever" often applied to created beings, .. 27
John i. 1, explained, ... 28
Hindoos believe in one Godhead, consisting of numerous persons under it, ... 29
Jesus performs wonderful works, which do not amount to equality with those of God, ... ibid.

CHAP. III.

The first position of the Editor, on the ubiquity of Jesus, 32
John iii. 13 explained, ... ibid.
—— viii. 58, ... ibid.
John xi. 8, 38; Matt. xxvi. 2; John xiii. 6; xvi. 32; Matt. ii. 18; John vi. 62, ... 33
John xvi. 7, 5, 28; xiii. 36, 1, ... 34
Matthew xviii. 20, explained, ... 35
Luke xvi. 29, ... 36
The second position of the Editor, on the incomprehensibility of the nature of Jesus, ... ibid.
Matt. xi. 27, explained, ... ibid.
John xiv. 16, 17, ... 37
Mark xiii. 32, explained, ... 38
Matt. xi. 28, explained, ... ibid.
The third position of the Editor, on Jesus forgiving sins in an independent manner, ... 39
Mark ii. 5, 9, explained, ... ibid.
Acts v. 31, 32; xiii. 38; Luke xxiii. 34; xi. 4; Matt. vi. 14, 40
The fourth position of the Editor, respecting the Almighty power of Jesus, ... ibid.
John v. 21—23, explained, ... 41
—— 19—36, ... 42

Deut. xviii. 15, and 18; Acts iii. 32; vii. 37; Matt. xx. 23; xii. 28; xxvi. 39, considered, ... 44
Matt. xxvi. 42; Luke xxii. 32; John xii. 27; Matt. x. 40; John v. 23, separately explained, ... 45
Matt. v. 48, ... 46
The fifth position of the Editor, respecting the judgment of the world by Jesus, ... ibid.
Matt. iii. 9; Luke i. 37, ... ibid.
From this the Editor infers his omniscience, ... 47
Mark xiii. 32; John v. 26, 27, 30, considered, .. ibid.
The sixth position of the Editor, respecting the worship accepted by Jesus, ... 48
Daniel ii. 46; Matt. xviii. 26, considered, ... ibid.
John iv. 24; Matt. iv. 10; xix. 66; John ix. 31, 33, 38, 49
Mark v. 7; Luke xvii. 15, 16; Matt. xiv. 33; xv. 25; Mark viii. 9; Luke xxiv. 19, ... 50
John vi. 69; xx. 31; Matt. viii. 2, ... 51
The worship paid to Jesus inferior to divine .. 48—51
Jesus himself worshipped the Father; Matt. vi. 9; xxvi. 53; John xvi. 26; Luke xxii. 41, 42; Mark xiv. 35, 36; vi. 12; Luke x. 21; John xi. 41; Matt. xxviii. 46; John iv. 22, ... 51
The seventh position of the Editor, respecting the form of Baptism, Matt. xix. 28; Exod. xiv. 31, ... 53
Mohummud joins his own name with that of God in his form of belief, ... 54
Matt. xxviii. 18, considered, ... ibid.
Synonimous expressions employed by Mohummud and Jesus, ... 55
Mussulmans notwithstanding remain strict monotheists, .. 56

CHAP. IV.

Texts adduced in support of the atonement explained, .. 57
Luke iv. 43; ii. 47—49; John xvii. 8, ... 58
The sufferings of Jesus and of other Prophets unaccountable except as prophesied, ... 59

John x. 3; Mark xii. 1—9, considered, ... 60
John xv. 2, 22, ... 61
Whether Jesus suffered as God or as Man for mankind, .. ibid.
The first inconsistent with the nature of God, .. ibid.
The last inconsistent with justice, ... 62
Jesus averse to the death of the cross, ... ibid.
Matthew xxvi. 37, 39, 42, and 43, considered, .. ibid.
Mark xiv. 36; Luke xxii. 42, 44; John xii. 27; John xi. 17, 18; Matthew xxvi. 53, 54, considered, .. 63
The application of the term Saviour to Jesus a supposed proof of the atonement, ... 64
Obadiah 21; Nehemiah ix. 27, considered, .. ibid.
2 Kings xiii. 5, ... 65
Jesus is a Saviour from inculcating the word of God, .. ibid.
John xv. 3; v. 24; vi. 63, considered, ... ibid.
God declares Christ a Prophet equal to Moses, .. ibid.
Matthew v. 7; xxiii. 2, and 3, ... 66
Jesus was a perfect teacher of the divine will, .. ibid.
Matthew v. 21, and 22, ... ibid.
—v. 27 and 28 31, and 32, 38, and 39, 43, 44, 45, considered 67
The term "Lamb of God" explained, ... 68
Nature of Christ, ... 69
God shews mercy for righteousness' sake, ... ibid.
Genesis xxx. 27; Jeremiah xxvii. 18; Genesis xlviii. 16; Exodus xxiii. 20, 21 70
The Author offers no opinion on this doctrine, .. ibid.

CHAP. V.

Disputes ascribed to the different interpretations of the Dogmas, ... 71
Illiberality in supposing that the primitive Christians shed each other's blood from worldly motives, .. 72
Mosheim's authority, vol. i. page 419, 420, ... 73

Ill'beral remarks may be equally applied to the Apostles and Martyrs, ... 73
The cause of the final success of Alexandrians (afterwards called the Orthodox) over Arians, ... 74
Violent contentions between Roman Catholics and Protestants, ibid.
Matthew, chap. x. 34, explained by its context, .. 75
Difference between the peculiar Doctrines of the Gospel and the tenet of the existence of God, ... 77
The miracles quoted by the Reviewer to shew their importance considered, ... 78
Matthew xi. 2, 3, and 4; John x. 37 and 38; xiv. 11; Matthew xii. 39; John xx. 29, considered, .. 79
The arguments adduced by the Reviewer in support of Christian miracles are equally applicable to Hindoo miracles, 81
And also to the miraculous narrations of Mussulmans, 82
Superior excellence of the Precepts of Jesus, .. ibid.

CHAP. VI.

Only one circumstance adduced in support of the Deity of the Spirit as a distinct person, ... 83
The association of the name of the Spirit with that of the Father and Son inadequate to prove this doctrine, .. 84
Prophets associated with God, 2d Chron. xx. 20; Jerem. xxx. 9; Luke iii. 16, ... ibid.
The Holy Spirit explained to be the guiding influence of God, John xiv. 6; xvi. 13, ... 85
Anger, mercy, truth, &c. personified as well as the Holy Spirit, 2 Kings xxiv. 20; Psalms xc. 7; xxi. 7; vi. 4; Luke xii. 12; Acts i. 8; John xiv. 26; Psalm lvii. 3; lxxxv. 10; c. 5; xxxiii. 22; xxxvi. 5; cviii. 4; vii. 3; 2 Chron. xxiv. 18, ... 86
The bad consequences of supposing the Spirit to be a person of God, Matt. i. 11, 20; Luke i. 35, ... 87
This opinion also inconsistent with the use of the term in Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 16; Acts x. 38; Matt. xii. 28, 31; Luke iv. 1; iii. 22, ... 88

The Jews accuse Jesus of employing diabolical influence, .. 90
Matt. xii. 24, 37, with context; and Mark iii. 29,30, explained, ... 91
The Spirit of God was bestowed before the coming of Jesus, Luke i. 15, 41, 67; ii. 25, 26; Mark xii. 36; Matt. xxii. 43; Luke iv. 1, ... 93
Acts v. 3, 4; John xv. 26, explained, ... 95
The plural number of nouns and pronouns in Hebrew, &c. is often used for a singular agent or object. Gen. i. 26; Deut. iv. 4; Exod. xxi. 4, 6; Isaiah vi. 8, .. 96
The same rule observed in Arabic; of which an example from the Qoran, ... 98
The thrice repeated term "holy" in Isaiah vi. 3, noticed, 99
The verse which has been introduced as John v. 7, noticed, ibid.
The Trinity not taught by the Apostles, ... 100
This proved by Acts iv. 22, 32, 36; iii. 22, 23; iv. 12, 26, 27; v. 31, 7; viii. 37, 38; x. 38, 42; xiii. 38; xvii. 3, 101
Extracts from Mosheim, vol. i. p. 100, 411, 412, 414, shewing that so late as the year 314 the Deity of the Son was not considered a fundamental article of faith, .. 103
Reason why Trinitarians prevailed at the Council of Nice, 106
Another extract from Mosheim, p. 25. Acts xxviii. 6, and xiv. 11, quoted, ... 106, 107
Other extracts from Mosheim, shewing that polytheism was familiar to the Christian converts of the first ages, (p. 25, 46,) 107
The prevalence of the Trinity attributable only to the prejudices of education, ... 108
The alleged two-fold consciousness of Jesus Christ considered, ... ibid.
Moses might also be said to have a two-fold consciousness, 109
Mode of reconciling apparent contradictions in Scripture, 110
Difficulties arising from neglecting this mode, .. ibid.
The argument drawn from the analogy of the soul, will, and perception to the Trinity, considered, ... 111

The argument drawn from the analogy of the sun, light, and heat to the Trinity, considered 112
On the argument which represents Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as qualities of one Deity, ... 113
The union between Father and Son, compared to that between the human soul and body, ... ibid.
Argument drawn from the alleged resemblance between the term "Son of Man" and "Son of God," .. 114
On the argument which represents God as a compound substance, ... ibid.
John xvii. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 24; viii. 6; Ephes. iv. 5, 6, quoted, 115
Alleged necessity of the Deity of Jesus to his mediatorial character, ... ibid.
This opposed to common sense, ... 116
Opposed also to scripture; Numb. xi. 1, 2; xiv. 19, 20; xxi. 7; xxxii. 30; Gen. xviii. 32; Jeremiah xxvii. 18; Deuteronomy v. 5, ... 116—117
The arguments of Hindoos for polytheism more powerful than those of Christians for the Trinity, .. 118

APPENDIX.

No. I.

On the Quotations from the Old Testament contained in the New.

Matt. ii. 15, ... 119
Matt. iv. 4, ... ibid.
——— 7, ... ibid.
—— ix. 13, ... 121
—— xix. 19; xxii. 39, ... ibid.
—— xxi. 42, ... ibid.
—— xxii. 44, ... 122
John x. 35, ... ibid.

Matt. iv. 10, ... 122
—— xiii. 14, ... ibid.
—— xix. 5, ... 123
——— 18, 19, ... ibid.
—— xxii. 32, ... ibid.
—— xxii. 37, ... ibid.
—— xxvi. 31, ... 124
John vi. 45, ... ibid.
—— xiii. 18, ... ibid.
—— xv. 25, ... 125
Matt. xxi. 16, ... ibid.
——— 13, ... ibid.
Matt. xv. 7, 8, 9, ... 126
—— xi. 10, ... ibid.
Luke iv. 8, ... ibid.
——— 18, 19, ... ibid.
These quotations prove the subordinate nature of Jesus to God, ... 127

No. II.

On the references made to the Old Testament in support of the Deity of Jesus.

John i. 14, compared with Isaiah ix. 6, explained, .. 128
Hebrews i. 8, 9, compared with Psalm xlv. 6, 7, considered, 140
Luke i. 16, 17, compared with Isaiah xl. 3, and Malachi iii. 1, 141
John xii. 41, compared with Isaiah vi. 5, .. 142
1 Cor. i. 30, compared with Jeremiah xxiii. 6, .. ibid.
The original of Jeremiah xxiii. 6; xxxiii. 16; Gen. xxv. 26; 2 Sam. ii. 16; Gen. xvi. 14, compared .. 143
Rom. xiv. 10, 12, compared with Isaiah xlv. 23, .. 144
2d Peter iii. 18, compared with Isaiah xliii. 3, on the term Saviour, ... 145
John x. 16, compared with Psalm xxiii. 1, on the term Shepherd, ... 146

1 Cor. x. 9. compared with Psalm lxxviii. 56, on tempting Christ, ... 147
John iii. 29, compared with Psalm liv. 5, on the term husband, ... 148
Revelation xxii. 13, compared with Isaiah xliv. 6, on the phrase "Alpha and Omega," 149
Rev. xxii. 12, compared with Isaiah xl. 10, on the phrase "My reward is with me," 152
Ephes. iv. 8, compared with Psalm lxviii. 18, on the phrase "Thou hast ascended on high," .. .. ibid.
John xix. 37, compared with Zechariah xii. 10, on the phrase "whom they pierced," 153
1 Peter ii. 6, 7, 8, compared with Isaiah xxviii. 16, and viii. 13, 14, on the phrase "stone of stumbling, &c." 155
The Hebrew and other Asiatic languages full of metaphor, John x. 34, 35, 36, ... 157
The Deity of Moses and of David cannot be proved from Deut. xxx. 15; 1 Chron. xxix. 20, .. 158
Personal interest does not influence the author; nor desire of fame, ... 159
Nor the hope of success, ... 160
But reverence for the author of Christianity, and a wish to raise it above all polytheistical systems, .. ibid.
The author's views derived from the Scriptures, .. ibid.
The Old Testament should be studied before the New, 161
Locke's testimony respecting the fundamental articles of Christianity, ... ibid.
Extract from Sir Isaac Newton, pointing out the different natures of God and Christ, ... 162
Argument in favor of the Trinity, from its analogy to the triangle, considered, ... ibid.
Several arguments occurring in the beginning of Serle's Horæ Solitariæ considered, ... 164
Conclusion, ... 168

POSTSCRIPT.

Dr. Prideaux's assertion respecting the testimony of Jonathan's Targum on Isaiah ix. 6, 7, examined, .. 169
The term "Messiah" applied to various kings, .. 170
Quotations from several ancient Jewish commentators, .. 171
On the difference of meaning between "to be called" and "to be," .. .. ibid.
Passages illustrating the epithets employed in Isaiah ix. 6, ibid.
The terms "Son" and "only-begotten" incompatible with the nature of the First Cause, ... 172
The assertion respecting two sets of terms and phrases being applied to Jesus, examined, ... ibid.
No Hindoo can conscientiously prefer the doctrine of the Trinity to Hindooism, ... 173
True Christianity is free from polytheism, .. ibid.

A SECOND APPEAL.

CHAPTER I.

General defence of the Precepts in question.

THE observations contained in No. I. of the quarterly series of "The Friend of India," on the Introduction to "The Precepts of Jesus," as well as on their defence, termed "An Appeal to the Christian Public," are happily expressed in so mild and Christian-like a style, that they have not only afforded me ample consolation for the disappointment and vexation I felt from the personality conveyed in the preceding Magazines, (Nos. 20 and 23), but have also encouraged me to pursue my researches after the fundamental principles of Christianity in a manner agreeable to my feelings, and with such respect as I should always wish to manifest for the situation and character of so worthy a person as the Editor of the Friend of India.

The Reverend Editor labours in his Review to establish two points—the truth and excellency of the miraculous relations and of the dogmas found in the Scriptural writings—and 2ndly, the insufficiency of the compiled Precepts of Jesus alone to lead to sal-

vation, unless accompanied with the important doctrines of the Godhead of Jesus and his atonement.

As the Compiler neither in his Introduction to the Precepts of Jesus, nor in his defence of those Precepts, has expressed the least doubt as to the truth of any part of the Gospels, the arguments adduced by the learned Editor to demonstrate the truth and excellence of the authority on which they rest, are, I am inclined to think, quite superfluous and foreign to the matter in question.

The only reasons assigned by the Compiler, (Introduction, page 4), for separating the Precepts from the abstruse doctrines and miraculous relations of the New Testament are, that the former "are liable to the doubts and disputes of free-thinkers and anti-christians, and the latter are capable at best of carrying little weight with the natives of this part of the globe, the fabricated tales handed down to them being of a more wonderful nature."

These sentiments respecting the doctrines and miracles, founded as they are upon undeniable facts do not, I presume, convey any disavowal or doubt of their truth. Besides, in applying the term "fabricated" to the tales received by the credulous Hindoos, the Compiler clearly evinced the contemptible light in which he viewed those legends; and in stating that the miracles of the Scriptures were subject to the

doubts of "free-thinkers and anti-christians," it can never fairly be supposed that he meant himself, or any other person labouring in the promulgation of Christianity, to be included in that class.

As to the second point urged by the Reverend Editor, namely, that the compiled Precepts were not sufficient to lead to salvation, I deeply regret that the Editor should appear to have overlooked the authority of the gracious author of this religion in the several passages cited by the Compiler in his Appeal, to prove beyond doubt the sufficiency of the Precepts in question to procure eternal life; as it is almost impossible that so numerous quotations, spreading over a great part of the Appeal, could have escaped his notice. The Rev. Editor, while endeavouring to prove, that the compiled Precepts would fall short of guiding to peace and happiness, only illustrates by sacred authority the truth and excellency of the miracles and the doctrines of Christianity. But such illustration can have no tendency to demonstrate the position he endeavours to maintain; I am therefore under the necessity of repeating a few passages already quoted, with some others, shewing that the compiled Precepts are sufficient to conduct the human race to happiness; and I humbly intreat to know, if I be persuaded to believe in the divine origin of those passages, and in the entire veracity of their author, how I am to reconcile their authority with the position maintained by the learned Editor, as to the insufficiency of

the Precepts of Jesus to guide to peace and happiness.—*Matthew*, chap. xxii. beginning with verse 37, " Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; this is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets." *Mark*, chap. xii. beginning with verse 29, " And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength:—this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is no other commandment greater than these." *Matthew*, chap. vii. verse 12, " Therefore all things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them; for this is the Law and the Prophets." *Luke*, chap. x. from verse 25, " And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? How readest thou? He answering said: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right. *This do, and thou shalt live.*" *Matt.* vii. 21, "Not every one that

saith unto me, Lord! Lord! shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say unto me in that day, Lord! Lord! have we not prophesied in thy name; and in thy name have cast out devils; and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity. Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock; and every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand." *Luke*, chap. xi. verse 27, "Blessed is the womb (said a certain woman to Jesus) that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked: but he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." *John*, chap. xv. verse 12, "This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you." verse 17, "These things I command you, that ye love one another." Chap. xiii. verse 34, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." 35, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." Observing those two commandments, (verse 37, 38, and 39, chap. xxii. *Mat.*) selected by the Saviour as a substitute for all the Law and the Prophets, and sufficient means to produce peace and happiness to mankind, the Compiler never scrupled to

follow the example set forth by Jesus himself in compiling such Precepts as include those two commandments, and their subsidiary moral doctrines, as a true substitute of the Gospel, without intending to depreciate the rest of the word of God. I regret that the Reverend Editor should have disapproved of this compilation on the ground, that "it is of importance that every compilation be given as a sample of the sacred writings in all their excellence and importance, and not as a substitute for the whole."

The authority of St. Paul, the most exalted among primitive Christians, quoted by the Reverend Editor, (page 89), "If righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain," is not, I presume, adequate to set aside, nor even applicable to the express authority of the Author of Christianity, already quoted; as the latter includes not only the Mosaic law, to which St Paul alludes, but both law and religion, as is evident from the following passages: "Therefore all things whatever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to men; for this is the Law and the Prophets." "On these two commandments (to love God and to love our neighbours) hang all the Law and the Prophets." Every one must admit, that the gracious Saviour meant by the words "the Law and the Prophets," all the divine commandments found in the Scriptures, obedience to which is strictly required of us by the founder of that religion. *Luke*, xi. 28. "Blessed are

they that hear the word of God, and keep it." *John*, chap. xiv. 16, "If you love me, keep my commandments." Had the manifestation of love towards God with all our strength, and towards our neighbours as ourselves, been practically impossible, as maintained by the Editor, (page 112), or had any other doctrines been necessary to lead to eternal life, Jesus of Nazareth, (in whose veracity, candour, and perfection, we have happily been persuaded to place implicit confidence,) could not, consistently with his office as the Christ of God, have enjoined the lawyer to the obedience of those two commandments, and would not have promised him eternal life as the reward of such obedience; *(vide Luke* x. verse 28, "*This do and thou shalt live;)*" for a man possessed of common sense and common humanity would not incite another to labour in vain by attempting what was practically impossible, nor delude him with promise of a reward upon conditions beyond his power to fulfil; much less could a Being, in whom dwelt all truth, and who was sent with a divine law, to guide mankind by his preaching and example, inculcate precepts that it was impracticable to follow.—Any commandment enjoining man to love God with all his heart and all his strength, requires of us of course to direct our love towards him as the sole Father of the universe; but does not amount to a prohibition of the pursuits necessary for life, or to an abstinence from love towards any other object; for such love also is enjoin-

ed by the subsequent commandment. The following passages, *John*, chap. xiv. verse 21, "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him." Chap. xv. verse 10, "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love." verse 14, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you, &c." and many other passages of a similar import exhibit clearly, that love of and adherence to Jesus can be evinced solely by obedience to the divine commandments. But if the observance of those commandments be treated as practically impossible, the love of Jesus and adherence to him must likewise be so considered, and Christianity altogether regarded as existing only in theory.

I appeal to the Reverend Editor himself, whether we are to set at defiance the express commandments of Jesus, under the supposition that manifestation of the love enjoined by him is practically impossible? Yet this we must do, if we are to adopt the position of the Editor, found in his Review, page 111, "That the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law, can never lead to happiness and peace, unless by causing men to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross;" meaning, I presume, the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, as an atonement for the sins of mankind.

As the Reverend Editor has most fairly and justly confined himself to arguments, founded on the authority of the divine Teacher himself, I should hope to be allowed to beg him to point out, in order to establish his position, even a single passage pronounced by Jesus, enjoining a refuge in such a doctrine of the cross, as all-sufficient or indispensable for salvation; so that his position, thus supported, may be placed in competition with that founded on those passages which I have quoted in the foregoing paragraph, shewing both the indispensableness and the all-sufficiency of the excellent Precepts in question to procure salvation; and may impel us to endeavour to reconcile contradictions, which would in that case be shewn to subsist between the passages, declaring the all-sufficiency of the moral precepts preached by Christ for eternal life, and those that might be found to announce the indispensableness of the doctrine of the cross for everlasting happiness.

It is however evident, that the human race are naturally so weak, and so prone to be led astray by temptations of temporary gratifications, that the best and wisest of them fall far short of manifesting a strict obedience to the divine commandments, and are constantly neglecting the duty they owe to the Creator and to their fellow-creatures; nevertheless, in reliance on numerous promises found in the sacred writings, we ought to entertain every hope of enjoying the blessings of pardon from the merciful

Father through repentance, which is declared the only means of procuring forgiveness of our failures. I have already quoted some of these comforting passages in my Appeal, page 11; but as the Reverend Editor seems to have entirely overlooked them, and omitted to notice them in any of his publications, I deem it necessary to repeat them here with a few additions. *Ezekiel*, chap. xviii. verse 30, "Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin." *Luke*, chap. xiii. verse 3. "Except you repent, you shall all likewise perish." Chap. xv. verse 7, "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine persons who need no repentance." Matthew Chap. ix. verse 13, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." *Matthew*, iii. verse 2, John the Baptist preached, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and Jesus after his resurrection, lastly, directs his disciples. *Luke*, chap. xxiv. verse 47, "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem," wherein he declares the remission of sins as an immediate and necessary consequence of repentance.

The foregoing authorities and remarks will, I trust, suffice with every candid reader, as my apology for persisting in the conviction, that the Precepts compiled and published as a guide to peace and happiness, though deficient in respect to speculative doc-

trines and creeds, as well as narrative, yet contain all that is essential in practical Christianity; since they teach us the performance of our duty to God and to our fellow-creatures, and the most acceptable atonement on our part to the All-merciful, when we have fallen short of that duty.

CHAPTER II.

Natural inferiority of the Son to the Father.

IN endeavouring to prove what he represents as "the most abstruse, and yet the most important of doctrines, the Deity of Jesus Christ," the Reverend Editor advances seven positions—1st, that Jesus was possessed of ubiquity, an attribute peculiar to God alone. 2ndly, That he declared that a knowledge of his nature was equally incomprehensible with that of the nature of God. 3rdly, That he exercised the power of forgiving sins, the peculiar prerogative of God. 4thly, That he claimed almighty power, "in the most unequivocal manner." 5thly, That his heavenly Father had committed to him the final judgment of all who have lived since the creation. 6thly, That he received worship due to God alone. 7thly, That he associated his own name with that of God the Father in the sacred rite of baptism.—The facts on which the Editor labours to establish these positions, however, seem to me, upon an impartial examination, not only unfavourable to his inference, but even confirmatory of the opposite opinion.—For admitting for a moment, that the positions of the Editor are well founded, and that the

Saviour was in possession of attributes and powers ascribed to God; have we not his own express and often repeated avowal, that all the powers he manifested, were committed to him as the Son by the Father of the Universe? And does not reason force us to infer, that a Being who owes to another all his power and authority, however extensive and high, should be in reality considered inferior to that other? Surely, therefore, those who believe God to be Supreme, possessing the perfection of all attributes, independently of all other beings, must necessarily deny the identity of Christ with God: as the sun, although he is the most powerful and most splendid of all known created things, the greatest immediate source of life and enjoyment in this world, has yet no claim to be considered identical in nature with God, who has given to the sun all the light and animating warmth which he sheds on our globe. To effect a material change without the aid of physical means, is a power peculiar to God; yet we find this power exercised by several of the prophets on whom the gift of miracles was bestowed. Besides, it is evident from the first chapter of Genesis, that in the beginning of the creation God bestowed on man his own likeness, and sovereignty over all living creatures. Was not his own likeness and that dominion peculiar to God, before mankind were made partakers of them? Did God then deify man by such mark of distinction?

The following passages, I presume, suffice to illustrate the entire dependence of the Son on God, and his inferiority and subjection to, and his living by, him. *St. John*, chap. x. verses 17 and 18, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. *This commandment have I received of my Father.*" Chap. xii. verse 49, "For I have not spoken of myself: but the Father *who sent me, he gave me commandment* what I should say, and what I should speak." *Chap.* xiv. *verse* 31, "But that the world may know that I love the Father, and *as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do.*" Chap. xvii. verses 1 and 2, Jesus in his prayer—"Glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee; *as thou hast given him power* over all flesh, that he should give eternal life *to as many as thou hast given him.*" *John*, chap. iii. verse 35, "The Father loveth the Son, and *hath given all things* into his hand." Chap. v. verse 19, "*The Son can do nothing of himself*, but what he seeth the Father do, &c." 22, "For the Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed* all judgment unto the Son." 30, "*I can of mine own self do nothing*: as I hear I judge; and my judgment is just; because *I seek not my own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me.*" Chap. vi. verse 37, "All that the *Father giveth me shall come to me, &c.*" 38, For I came down

from heaven, *not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.*" Chap. viii. verse 28, "*That I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me,* I speak these things." Verse 50, "I seek not my own glory; there is one that seeketh and judgeth." Chap. xiv. verse 24, "The word which ye hear is not mine, *but the Father's which sent me.*" Verse 31, "*As the Father gave me commandment, even* so I do." And after his resurrection Jesus saith, Chap. xx. verse 21, "*As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.*" Verse 17, "I ascend unto *my Father* and *your Father, to my God* and *your God.*" *Matthew,* chap. xii. verse 18, from Isaiah, "Behold *my servant, whom I have chosen;* my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased; *I will put my spirit upon him,* and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles." Chap. xxviii. verse 18, "And Jesus came and spoke unto them, saying, *All power is given unto me* in heaven and in earth." *Luke,* chap. i. verse 32, "He shall be great, and shall be called *the Son of the Highest:* and the *Lord God shall give unto him* the throne of his father David." For testimony that he lived by the Father, see *John,* vi. 57, "As the living Father *hath sent me, and I live by the Father, &c.*" Chap. v. ver. 26, "For as the Father hath life in himself, *so hath he given to the Son* to have life in himself."

As the Reverend Editor in two instances quot-

ed, perhaps inadvertently, the authority of the Apostles, I think myself justified in introducing some of the sentiments entertained by them on this subject, though I should be contented to deduce my arguments, as proposed by the Editor, exclusively from the direct authority of Jesus himself—I shall confine myself to the quotation of one or two texts from the Epistles of St. Paul. 1st *Corinthians, chap.* xv. *verse* 24—28, "Then cometh the end, when he shall have *delivered up the kingdom to God*, even the Father. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet: the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet: but when he saith, All things are put under him; it is manifest that *he is excepted which did put all things under him.* And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall *the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him*, that God may be all in all." *Colossians*, i. 15, "Who is the image of the invisible God, *the first-born of every creature.*"

From a due attention to the purport of the above quoted texts, and to the term *Son*, distinctly mentioned in them, the reader will, I trust, be convinced, that those powers were conferred on Jesus, and declared by himself to have been received by him from the Father, as the Messiah, Christ, or anointed Son of God, and not solely in his human capacity; and that such interpretation as declares these

and other passages of a similar effect to be applicable to Jesus as a man, is an unscriptural invention. Jesus spoke of himself throughout all the Scriptures only as the promised Messiah, vested with high glory from the beginning of the world. *John*, xvii. 5, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine ownself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." In this passage, with the same breath with which he prays for glory, he identifies *the nature* in which he does so with that under which he lived with God before the creation of the world, and of course before his assuming the office of the Messiah. Verse 24, "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me *be with me where I am;* that they may behold *my glory, which thou hast given me:* for thou *lovedst me before the foundation of the world.*" Here again Jesus prays, that his Apostles may witness such honor as the Father had bestowed on him, even before the foundation of the world. Chap. ix. verse 35—37, "Dost thou," (says Jesus to a man who had been blind,) "believe on the *Son of God?* He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both *seen him, and it is he* (the Son of God) *that talketh with thee.*" Chap. xvii. ver. 1, 2, "Father, glorify *thy Son;* as *thou hast given him* power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as *thou hast given him.*" John the Baptist, who bore witness of Christ, looked not upon him

in any other view than as the Son of God. *St. John*, i. 34, "And I saw and bare record, (said John the Baptist, pointing out the person of Jesus), that *this is the Son of God.*" *John*, viii. 42, "I proceeded forth and came from God; *neither came I of myself, but he sent me;*" and in numerous passages Jesus declares, that before he assumed the office of the Messiah in this world, he was entirely subject to and obedient to the Father, from whom he received the commission to come to this world for the salvation of mankind. But apparently with the very view of anticipating any misapprehension of his nature on the part of his disciples, to whom he had declared the wonderful extent of the powers committed to him by the Father, he tells them *John*, xiv. 28, "The Father is greater than I." It would have been idle to have informed them of a truth, of which as Jews they would never have entertained the smallest question, that in his mere corporeal nature Jesus was inferior to his maker; and it must therefore have been his spiritual nature of which he here avowed the inferiority to that of God.

"The Son" is a term which, when used without being referred to another proper name found in the context, implies invariably the Son of God throughout the whole New Testament, especially when associated with the epithet "The Father;" so the latter epithet, when it stands alone, signi

fies "the Father of the universe." *Matthew*, chap. xxviii. 19, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Chap. xi. verse 27, "No man knoweth the Son but the Father, &c." Vide rest of the Gospel.—It is true indeed, that the angels of God and some of the ancients of the human race, as well as the children of Israel, are honoured in the sacred writings with the name of "Sons of God." *Job* i. 6, "There was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord." *Genesis*, vi. 9, "The sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair." *Hosea*, i. 10, "Then it shall be said unto them, ye are *the sons of the living God:*" yet the epithet "Son of God," with the definite article prefixed, is appropriated to Christ, the first-born of every creature, as a distinct mark of honor which *he alone* deserves.

The Saviour having declared that unity existed between the Father and himself, *John*, x. 30, "I and my Father are one," a doubt arose with regard to the sense in which the unity affirmed in those words should be accepted. This Jesus removes by defining the unity so expressed as a subsisting concord of will and design, such as existed amongst his Apostles, and not identity of being; vide xvii. 11, of John, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, *that they may be one*, as *we are*."—Verse 22, "The glory which

thou gavest me I have given them; that *they may be one, even as we are one.*" Should any one understand by these texts real unity and identity, he must believe that there existed a similar identity between each and all of the Apostles;—nay even that the disciples also were included in the Godhead, which in that case would consist of a great many times the number of persons ascribed to the Trinity. *John* xvii. 20, 21, 22 and 23, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word—That *they all may be one;* as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.—That *they may be one, even as we are one. I in them, and thou in me:* that they may be made *perfect in one.*" I know not how it is possible for those who profess obedience to the word of Christ to overlook the explanation he has here so clearly given of the nature of the unity existing between him and the Father, and to adopt a contrary system apparently introduced by some heathen writers to suit their polytheistical prejudices; but I doubt not the Editor of the Friend of India will admit the necessity of giving preference to divine authority over any human opinion, however prevailing it may be.

The Saviour meant unity in design and will by the assertion also, that he was in God, or dwelt in God and God in him. *John*, x. 38, "That ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him," as evidently appears from the following

passages:—*John*, xiv. 20, "At that day ye shall know (addressing his Apostles) that I am in my Father, and *ye in me, and I in you.*" *Chap.* xvii. *ver.* 21, "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one in us.*" *John*, vi. 56. "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, *dwelleth in me, and I in him.*" 1 *John*, iv. 15, "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God—God *dwelleth in him, and he in God.*" There appear but three modes in which such passages are capable of interpretation. 1st. As conveying the doctrine that the Supreme Being, the Son, and the Apostles were to be absorbed mutually as drops of water into one whole; which is conformable to the doctrines of that sect of Hindoo Metaphysicians who maintain, that in the end the human soul is absorbed into the Godhead; but is quite inconsistent with the faith of all denominations of Christians. 2dly, As proving an identity of nature, with distinction of person, between the Father, the Son, and the Apostles;—a doctrine equally inconsistent with the belief of every Christian, as multiplying the number of persons of the Godhead far beyond what has ever been proposed by any sect: or 3rdly, As expressing *that unity* which is said to exist wherever there are found perfect concord, harmony, love, and obedience, such as the Son evinced towards the Father, and taught the disciples to display towards the divine will.—That the language of our Saviour can be understood in

this last sense solely, will, I trust, be readily acknowledged by every candid expounder of the sacred writings, as being the only one alike warranted by the common use of words, and capable of apprehension by the human understanding. Had not experience, indeed, too clearly proved that such metaphorical expressions, when taken singly and without attention to their contexts, may be made the foundation of doctrines quite at variance with the tenor of the rest of the Scriptures, I should have had no hesitation in submitting indiscriminately the whole of the doctrines of the New Testament to my countrymen; as I should have felt no apprehension that even the most ignorant of them, if left to the guidance of their own unprejudiced views of the matter, could misconceive the clear and distinct assertions they everywhere contain of the unity of God and subordinate nature of his messenger Jesus Christ. Many of these have been already quoted; to which may be added the following—*John*, xvii. 3, "This is life eternal, that they might know *thee the only true God*, and Jesus Christ *whom thou hast sent*." Here Jesus in addressing the Father declares, that the means to be afforded for eternal salvation, were a knowledge of God, and of himself as the anointed messenger of God. Also chap. xix. verse 17, Christ saith, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God." Here Jesus, pure as he was and without reproach, thinks it necessary to check the man who applies to him an epithet

ustly due to God only.—Chap. xiv. 1, "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God; believe *also* in me." In these words Jesus commands his disciples to put their trust in God, and further to believe in him as the Messenger of God; and thus plainly distinguishes himself from the Godhead.—Nor can it for a moment be understood by the following passage, *John*, xiv. 9, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," that God was literally and materially visible in the Son —a doctrine which would be directly contrary to the spirit of the religion taught by Jesus, and by all the Prophets of God. Vide *John*, iv. 24, "God is a Spirit." The Apostles also maintained a belief of the immateriality and invisibility of God, 1 *Tim.* vi. 16, "Whom no man hath seen nor can see." 2 *John*, iv. 12, "No man hath seen God at any time. Besides, Jesus explains himself in the two passages immediately succeeding, that by the phrase, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," he meant only that whosoever saw him and the works performed by him, witnessed proofs of the entire concord of his words and actions with the will and design of the Father, and ought therefore to have admitted the truth of his mission from God. *John*, xiv. 9. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. How sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?" verse 10. "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself; but the Father, that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." Ver. 11, "Believe me, that I

am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake." We have already seen in what sense the expression "dwelleth in me" must be understood, unless we admit that all true followers of Christ are admitted as portions of the Godhead. *John*, vi. 56. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him." 1 *John*, chap. iv. verse 12, "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us."

For my conviction, and for the satisfaction of those who consider the Precepts of Jesus as a guide to peace and happiness, his word, "They may be one as we are," *John*, xvii. 11, in defining the nature of the unity between God and Jesus, fully suffices. Disgusted with the puerile and unsociable system of Hindoo idolatry, and dissatisfied at the cruelty allowed by Moossulmanism against Non-moossulmans, I, on my searching after the truth of Christianity, felt for a length of time very much perplexed with the difference of sentiments found among the followers of Christ (I mean Trinitarians and Unitarians, the grand divisions of them), until I met with the explanation of the unity given by the divine Teacher himself as a guide to peace and happiness.—Besides, when the Jews misunderstood the phrase used by the Saviour, "I and my Father are one," and accused him of blasphemy, (chap. x. 33, "But for blasphemy, and because that thou being a man makest thyself God,)" Jesus in answer to the accusation denied having made

himself God, saying, verse 34—36, "Is it not written in your Law, I said, Ye are Gods? If ye called them Gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken: say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because *I said, I am the Son of God?*" How was it possible that Jesus, the founder of truth and true religion, should have *disavowed* the charge of making himself God by representing himself as the *Son*, honoured with sanctification *by the Father*, and *sent by him* to this world, if he were the true living God, possessed of everlasting sanctification, independently of another being. From this and all other local evidence the Pharisees and chief Priests, though inveterate enemies of the Saviour, accused him to Pilate of having made himself the Son of God and King of the Jews; but relinquished the charge of making himself equal to God, or having ascribed to himself divine nature; although the latter (i. e. making himself God) was better calculated to excite the horror of the people. *Vide John*, xix. 7, "The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die; because he made himself the Son of God." *Vide Matthew*, xxvii. 37, "And set up over his head his accusation written, This is Jesus, the King of the Jews." 43, "He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God." That the epithet God is frequently applied in the sacred Scriptures, otherwise than to the Supreme Being, as pointed out by

Jesus, may be shewn by the following out of many instances to be found in the Bible. *Deuteronomy*, x. 17, " For the Lord your God is God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, &c." xxxii. 21, " They have moved me to jealousy with *that which is not God.*"—*Exodus* xxii. 28, " *Thou shalt not revile the Gods*, nor curse the ruler of thy people." *Joshua*, xxii. 22, " The Lord *God of Gods* knoweth." *Psalm* lxxxii. 1, " God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; *he judgeth among the Gods.*" 6, " I have said, *Ye are Gods;* and all of you are children of the Most High." cxxxvi. 2, " O give thanks unto *the God of Gods.*" *Isaiah*, xli. 23, " Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know *that ye are Gods.*" *Psalm* xcvii. 7, " *Worship him, all ye Gods.*" *Zephaniah*, ii. 11. " He *will famish all the Gods of the earth.*" *Exodus*, iv. 16, " God said to Moses, that he should be to Aaron *instead of God.*" vii. 5, " See, *I have made thee* a *God* to Pharaoh." also 1 *Corinth.* viii. 5, " As *there be Gods many* and Lords many," and the verse already quoted from *John* x. 34, 35, " Jesus answered, Is it not written in your Law, *Ye are Gods?* If ye *call them Gods, to whom the word of God came, &c.*" In none of these instances is it in any degree admissible, that by the epithet God it is implied, that the human beings to whom it was attached were thereby declared to be a portion of the Godhead. Moses was to be as a God to Aaron and a God to Pharaoh by the express command of the Almighty; but no Christian will thence argue the equality of Moses with

the Father of all things. On what principle then can any stress be laid in defence of the deity of the Son on the prophetic expression quoted in Hebrews from Psalm xlvii. 6, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," especially when we find in the very next verse, words that declare his subordinate nature; "Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness: therefore *God, thy God,* hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows?" We cannot allow much weight to the phrase "for ever," as establishing literally the eternal nature of the power of the Son, this phrase being often found metaphorically applied in the Scriptures to other created beings: as *Proverbs,* xxix. 14, "The king that faithfully judgeth the poor, his throne shall be established for ever." *Deut.* iv. 40, "And that thou mayest prolong thy days in the earth, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, for ever." Similar to this is the remarkable expression of Jesus to Mary after his resurrection, and therefore at a time when no design can be conceived to have existed that could have been advanced by his any longer withholding the knowledge of his true nature, if any thing remained unrevealed during the previous period of his mission on earth. *John,* xx. 17, "Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto *my Father and your Father,* and to *my God* and *your God.*"

After a slight attention to the terms Lord and God being often applied to men in the sacred writings,

can any weight be allowed to the exclamation of the astonished disciple, *John*, xx. 28, "My Lord and my God;" especially as the Apostle who relates the circumstance within a few verses concludes by saying, 31, "These are written that ye might believe that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*;" but no where desires the readers of his Gospel to believe that Jesus is God?—Does not common sense point out the inferiority and subordination of a Being, though called God, to one who is at the same time declared to be *his* God, *his* father, *his* sanctifier, and *his* promoter to the state of exaltation?

The passage *John* i. 1, "The Word was God, and the Word was with God," which contains the term God twice, may according to such use of the term be interpreted without involving inconsistence with itself, or the contradiction which it apparently implies with another most decisive passage in *Deut.* xxxii. 39, where Moses representeth God as declaring, that *with* him there is no God: "See now that I, even I am he; and *there is no God with me*;" if it should be understood to signify in both instances the Supreme Deity. Should we follow on the other hand the interpretation adopted by Trinitarian Christians, namely, that the Godhead, though it is one, yet consists of three persons, and consequently one substance of the Godhead might abide with the other, both being equally God; we should in that case be forced to view the Godhead in the same light as we consider

mankind and other genera, for no doubt can exist of the unity of mankind:—the plurality of men consists in their persons; and therefore we may safely, under the same plea, support the unity of man, notwithstanding the plurality of persons included under the term mankind. In that case also Christians ought in conscience to refrain from accusing Hindoos of polytheism; for every Hindoo we daily observe confesses the unity of the Godhead. They only advance a plausible excuse for their polytheism, which is, that notwithstanding the unity of the Godhead, it consists of millions of substances assuming different offices correspondent to the number of the various transactions superintended in the universe by divine Providence, which they consider as infinitely more numerous than those of the Trinitarian scheme.

The Saviour in his appeal, "If I do not the works of my Father believe me not," *John*, x. 37, meant of course the performance of works prescribed by the Father, and tending to his glory. A great number of passages in the Scriptures, a few of which I have already cited, and the constant practice of the Saviour, illustrate this fact beyond doubt.—In raising Lazarus after he had died, Jesus prayed to the Father for the power of bringing him to life again, and thanked him for his compliance. *John*, xi. 41, "And Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee

that thou hast heard me." Besides, in declaring that whosoever believed him would do not only the works he performed, but even works of greater importance, Jesus never can be supposed to have promised to such believers equality in power with God, or to have exalted them above himself. *John*, xiv. 12, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do." vi. 29, "Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye *believe* on him whom he hath sent." It must be admitted that one, who can perform works of God independently of the Deity, is either greater than or equal in power to the Almighty. The wonderful works which Jesus was empowered to perform drew a great number of the Jews to a belief in Jesus as the promised Messiah, and confirmed his Apostles in their already acquired faith in the Saviour, and in the entire union of will and design that subsisted between him and the Father, as appears from the following passages; *John* vi. 14, "Then those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that *Prophet that should come into the world*." See also *John*, x. 21.

The Scriptures indeed in several places declare, that the Son was superior even to the angels in heaven, living from the beginning of the world to eternity, and that the Father created all things by him and for him. At the same time I must, in confor-

mity to those very authorities believe him as produced by the Supreme Deity among created Beings. *John*, v. 26, "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." *Colossians*, i. 15, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the *first-born of every creature*."

CHAP. III.

Separate consideration of the seven positions of the Reviewer.

IN attempting to support his first position, that Jesus was possessed of ubiquity, the Reverend Editor has quoted two passages. The first is, *St. John*, iii. 13, " No man has ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man who is in heaven ;" wherein Jesus, as the Editor conceives, declares his location both in heaven and on the earth at one time.—The Editor rests entirely the force of his argument upon the term " is," in the above phrase " who *is* in heaven," as signifying the presence of Jesus in heaven while he was conversing with Nicodemus on earth.—This argument might perhaps carry some weight with it, were not the frequent use of the present tense in a preterite or future sense observed in the sacred writings, and were not a great number of other passages to determine that the term " is," in this instance, must be understood in the past sense. *John*, viii. 58, " Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, *I am*." Here the same verb, though found in the form of the present tense, must obviously be taken in a preterite sense. *John*, xi. 8, " His disciples *say* unto him, Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee, &c." that is, His disciples *said* unto him. 38, " Jesus therefore again groaning in himself *cometh* to the grave."

i. e. he *came* to the grave. *Matthew*, xxvi. 2, "Ye know that after two days is the feast of the passover, and the Son of man *is* betrayed to be crucified;" that is, the Son of man *is to be* betrayed and to be crucified.—*vide* the remainder of the chapter. *John*, xiii. 6, "Then *cometh* he to Simon Peter, &c." that is, *he came* to Simon Peter, &c. Again, *John*, xvi. 32, "That ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: yet *I am* not alone," *i. e.* yet *I shall not be* alone. So in all the prophecies contained in the Old, as well as in the New Testament, the future tense must frequently be understood where the terms used are those grammatically appropriated to the preterite: as *Matthew*, ii. 18, "In Rama *was* there a voice heard," that is, *will there be* a voice heard. 15, "Out of Egypt *have I called* my Son," *i. e.* I *will call* my Son.—After a diligent attention to the following passage no one will, I presume, scruple to conclude that the Son was actually absent from heaven during his locality on the earth, and consequently the phrase quoted by the Editor is applicable only to the past time. *John*, vi. 62, "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he *was* before." The verb *was*, accompanied with the term *before* in this passage, positively implies the absence of Jesus from heaven during his stay on the earth. xvi. 7. "Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I *go away*. If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if *I depart*, I will send him unto you." 5, "But now I *go* my way to him that sent me." 28,

"*I came forth* from the Father, and am *come* into the world: again, I *leave* the world, and *go* to the Father." xiii. 36, "Jesus answered him, Whither *I go* thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt *follow* me afterwards." xiii. 1, "Jesus knew that his hour was come, that he should *depart out* of this world unto the Father." For further conviction I may safely refer even to the preceding terms of the verse relied on by the Editor:—"No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man." For the attribute of omnipresence is quite inconsistent with the human notions of the ascent and descent effected by the Son of man. Is it possible to reconcile the contents of hundreds of such passages, consistent with reason and conformable to the established order of interpretation, to the apparent meaning of a single phrase, that, taken literally, is totally opposed to common sense? For to a being named *the Son* or *the created* (the one term implying the other), and sent from one mansion to another, the attribute of ubiquity can never be justly ascribed.

Besides, in examining the original Greek Testament, we find in the phrase in question, "Who is in heaven," that the present participle ὢν, "being," is used in lieu of ἐστὶ, "is," viz. ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ; a true translation of which should be, "the *ens*" or "*being* in heaven:" and as the nominative case ὁ ὢν, "the being," requires a verb to complete the sense, it should be connected with the nearest

verb ἀναβέβηκεν, "hath ascended," no other verse in fact existing in the sentence.

The whole verse in the original runs thus: Καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. A verbal translation of the above would run thus: "And no one hath ascended into heaven, if not the out of heaven descender,—the Son of man—the being in heaven;" which words, arranged according to the rules of English grammar, should run thus; "And no one, except the descender from heaven, the Son of man, the being in heaven, hath ascended into heaven." In this case the presence of the Son in heaven must be understood as *referring* to the time of his ascent, and not to that of his addressing himself to Nicodemus—an explanation which, though it does not serve to establish the omnipresence of the Son urged by the Editor, ought to be satisfactory to an impartial mind*. The second passage which the Editor quotes on this subject is, *Matthew*, xviii. 20, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there *am* I in the midst of them." Is it not evident that

* See Bishop Middleton's "Doctrine of the Greek article." Part I. page 42. Note. "We are to refer the time of the participle to the time of the act &c. implied in the verb; for past, present, and future cannot be meant otherwise than in respect of that act." Leviticus, ch. vii. 23, ὁ προσφέρων—αυτῳ εσται ὁ βραχιων ὁ δεξιος. "The offering (person) for him shall be the right shoulder." xiv. 47. ὁ εσθων—πλυνει τα ιματια αυτου "The eating (person) shall wash his clothes." These present participles are referred to a time present with respect to the act of the verbs connected with them; but future with respect to the command of God. John i. 49 οντα—ειδον σε "I saw thee when thou wast." Moreover, we frequently find the present participle used in a past sense, even without reference to the time of the verb. John ix. 25, τυφλος ων αρτι βλεπω "Being blind now I see," that is, "Having been blind now I see."

the Saviour meant here, by being in the midst of two or three of his disciples, his guidance to them when joined in searching for the truth, without preferring any claim to ubiquity? We find similar expressions in the Scriptures, wherein the guidance of the Prophets of God is also meant by words that would imply their presence. *Luke*, xvi. 29, "Abraham saith unto him, *They have* Moses and the Prophets; let them hear them." No one will suppose that this expression is intended to signify that the Jews actually had Moses and the Prophets in person among them, or that they could hear them speak in the literal and not in the figurative sense of the words; nor can any one deduce the omnipresence of Moses and the Prophets from such expressions.

The second position advanced by the Reverend Editor is, that "Jesus ascribes to himself a knowledge and an incomprehensibility of nature equal to that of God, and peculiar to God alone;" and in attempting to substantiate this point he quotes *Matthew*, xi. 27, "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Here the Editor seems to rest on two grounds; 1st, That God is incomprehensible to man; 2ndly, That incomprehensibility of nature is peculiar to God alone:—whence the Rev. Editor draws his inference, that Jesus knowing the nature of God, and being himself possessed of an incomprehensible nature,

is equal with God. Now I should wish to know if the Editor, by the term "incomprehensible," understands a total impossibility of comprehension in any degree, or only the impossibility of attaining to a perfect knowledge of God.—If the former, I must be under the necessity of denying such a total incomprehensibility of the Godhead; for the very passage cited by the Editor declares God to be comprehensible not to the Son alone, but also to every one who would receive revelation from the Son; and in this case the latter part of the passage, "*He to whomsoever the Son will reveal him,*" must be acknowledged as conveying an exception to the assertion made in the former part of the sentence, "Neither knoweth *any man* the Father," &c.

We find also the following passages in *John* xiv. 16, 17, "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever: even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: *but ye know him,*"—wherein Jesus ascribes to his disciples a knowledge of the Holy Ghost, whom the Editor considers one of the persons of the Godhead, possessed of the same nature with God. But if the Editor understands by the passage he has quoted, the incomprehensibility of the real nature of the Godhead; I admit the position, but deny his inference, that such an incomprehensibility proves the nature of the object to be di-

vine, as being peculiar to God alone: for it appears evident that a knowledge of the real nature even of a common leaf, or a visible star, surpasses human comprehension; how then can a simple assertion, setting forth the incomprehensibility of an object, be considered as establishing its identity with God? In *Mark* xiii. 32, "But of that day and that hour *knoweth* no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the *Son*, but the Father," we have a passage, which, though it affirms in a stronger manner an *ignorance of the day* of resurrection, than that already quoted does of God, yet will not, I presume, be considered by any one as conveying the slightest insinuation of the divine nature of that day; though time is a common object of adoration amongst Idolators. In treating of this point the Editor quotes another text, *Matt.* xi. 28, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;"—wherein Jesus declares his power of affording rest, which the Editor considers as peculiar to God. All the Prophets, as well as Jesus, were from time to time sent by the Almighty to afford mental rest to mankind, by imparting to them the comforts of divine revelation; and by so doing they only fulfilled the commission given them by God: but no one ever supposed that in so doing they established claims to be considered incarnations of the divine essence. *Proverbs* xxix. 17, "Correct thy son, and he shall give thee rest; yea, he shall give delight unto thy soul." Revelation guides us to a

sure belief, that it is God that affords peace of mind, effects cures of the body, and bestows all sorts of comforts on his creatures. "I thank thee," (says Jesus, *Matthew* xi. 25,) "O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." Both our perceptions indeed and sacred authorities point out, that he lavishes all these gifts on us through prophets, physicians, and other physical causes, that are not considered by any sect as of a divine nature.

The third position is, that Jesus exercised in an independent manner, the prerogative of forgiving sins, which is peculiar to God alone; and the Reverend Editor quotes the passage, *Mark* ii. 5, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," and the 9th verse, "For whether is it easier to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise and walk?"—taking those texts as the grounds of his position, I therefore beg to call the attention of the Editor to the passage almost immediately following, in which the evangelical writer intimates, that this power of forgiving sins, as well as of healing men, was given by the Almighty. "But when the multitude saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God, *who had given* such power unto *men*." Does not this passage convey an express declaration, that Jesus was as much dependent on God in exercising the power of forgiving sins and healing the sick, as the Prophets who came forth from God

before him? The Apostles, who witnessed the power of forgiving sins in the Saviour, were thoroughly impressed with a belief that it was the Almighty Father who forgave sins through the Son. *Acts* v. 31, 32, "*Him hath God exalted* with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, *and forgiveness of sins.* And we are his witnesses of these things." Chap. xiii. 38, "Be it known, therefore, men and brethren, that *through this man*, (meaning the Saviour,) is preached unto you the *forgiveness of sins.*" I know not how far religious zeal in the breasts of many of the followers of Christ may excuse them in encroaching upon the prerogatives which revelation and reason ascribe to the divine Majesty alone; but Jesus himself clearly avows, that the power of forgiving sins had its source and origin in God alone, as appears from his petitioning the Father to forgive those that were guilty of bringing the death of the cross upon him, the greatest of all imaginable crimes. *Luke* xxiii. 34, "Father, forgive them," (says Jesus,) "for they know not what they do;" and from his directing all those that followed him to pray the Father alone for forgiveness of sins. *Luke* xi, 4. "And forgive us our sins." *Matthew* vi. 14, "If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will forgive you"

The fourth position advanced by the Editor is, that "Almighty power is also claimed by Jesus in the most unequivocal manner." In endeavouring to demonstrate

this, the Editor notices three passages of *John*, (chap. v. 21, 22, and 23,) " As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father." A candid enquirer after truth must, I think, feel surprised and disappointed, that in quoting these texts, the Editor should have overlooked the force of the words, in which the Son declares that he hath received the commission to judge from the Father; " For the Father judgeth no man, but *hath committed all judgment unto the Son.*" I am ready to admit indeed, that, taken simply as they stand, the words " As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will," and, " That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father," might very readily be understood as implying an assertion of equality with the Father. But this affords one of numerous instances of the danger of resting an opinion on the apparent meaning of the words of insulated passages of Scripture, without attention to the context; for I am convinced, that no unprejudiced person can peruse the verses preceding and subsequent to those quoted by the Editor, without feeling that a more explicit disavowal of equality with God can hardly be expressed by language than that which they contain:—I must therefore beg permission to give the entire passage in this place, though some parts of it

have been quoted before in support of arguments already discussed. It is to be observed, that the occasion of the expressions here made use of by Jesus was the accusation brought against him by the Jews, that he had made himself equal with God. —*John*, v. 19—36, " Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, *The Son can do nothing of himself*, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth; and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and *believeth on him that sent me*, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, *so hath he given to the Son* to have life in himself; and *hath given him authority* to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that

are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. *I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge:* and my judgment is just; *because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me.* If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. There is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth. But I receive not testimony from man: but these things I say, that ye might be saved. He was a burning and a shining light: and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light. But I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the *Father hath given me to finish,* the same works that I do, *bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.*"

It would have been strange indeed had Jesus, in repelling the accusation of blasphemy, which had wrought on the minds of the Jews so far that they sought to kill him, confirmed their assertion, that he made himself equal with God, and thus prematurely endangered his own life—but we find that so far from being further incensed by the explanation above quoted, they seem to have quietly acquiesced in his appeal to their own Scriptures, that the Messiah should have all the power and authority which he asserted the Father had given to himself. 46,

"For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me." The only text in the writings of Moses that refers to the nature of the Messiah, is that of *Deuteronomy*, xviii. 15 and 18, quoted by St. Peter in the Acts of the Apostles, iii. 22, and by St. Stephen, vii. 37, Moses said to the children of Israel, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, *like unto me; unto him* ye shall hearken." The words which the Lord addressed to Moses were exactly of the same import, "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, *like unto thee*, &c." It was no doubt to this remarkable passage that Jesus referred, and nothing can more distinctly prove the light in which he wished to be considered, namely, that of a Messenger or Prophet of God. But this is not the only instance in which Jesus entirely disclaims the attribute of omnipotence. On many other particular occasions he declares in the strongest language, his want of almighty power, and his constant need of divine influence. *Matthew*, xx. 23, "And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, *is not mine to give;* but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." xii. 28, "But if I cast out devils *by the Spirit of God*, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." xxvi. 39, "And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my

Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt." 42, "He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done." *Luke* xxii. 32, "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, &c." *John* xii. 27, "Father, save me from this hour." Whosoever honours God, cannot, I presume, consistently refuse to honour his Prophet, whom he dignified with the name of "Son of God;" and as he honours God he will also honour that Prophet, though he be well aware of the distinction beween the Almighty and his chosen Son. The honour paid to the Prophet may in this sense be fairly considered the test of the real degree of respect entertained for God—as Jesus saith, *Matthew* x. 40, "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." The obvious meaning of which words is, As far as men listen to your instructions, they listen to mine, and in so far they receive the commandments of God who hath sent me. Prejudice alone could, I think, infer from such expressions, that those who received the Apostles were literally receiving God himself under their form and substance. Equally demonstrative of prejudice, I conceive, would it be to deduce the identity or equality of the Father and the Son from the following passage; *John* v. 23, "That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who hath sent him." For in this very passage the Son is represented

as the Messenger of the Father, and for that reason only entitled to honour. That the preposition "as" implies here, as in many other places, likeness in nature and quality, and not in exact degree of honour, is illustrated by its obvious meaning in the last verse of *Matthew* vi. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect;" for by these words no one can conceive, that equality in degree of perfection between God and the disciples is intended to be enjoined.

The fifth position is, that his heavenly Father had committed to Jesus the final judgment of all who have lived since the creation. I readily admit the correctness of this position, and consider the fact as confirming the opinion maintained by me, and by numerous other followers of Christ, as to the Son's total dependence on the commission of God for his power in administering such judgment. I agree also with the Reverend Editor, in esteeming the nature of this office most important; and that nothing but the gift of supernatural wisdom can qualify a being to judge the conduct of thousands of millions of individuals, living at different times from the beginning of the world to the day of resurrection. It is however perfectly consistent with the omnipotence and wisdom of God, who is declared by revelation to be "able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham," (*Matthew* iii. 9.) and with whom all things are possible, (*Luke* i. 37.) to bestow wisdom

equal to the important nature of this office on the first-born of every creature, whom he has anointed and exalted even above his angels. But the Editor goes much further than I am willing to follow him, in concluding the omniscience of the Son, from the circumstance of his distributing final judgment; since Jesus not only disclaimed that attribute, but even expressly avowed that he received his qualifications for exercising judgment from God. With respect to his disclaiming omniscience, see *Mark* xiii. 32. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Omniscience, as the Editor must be well aware, has no limit; but here Jesus expressly declares, that he is ignorant of the day appointed by the Father for the resurrection and judgment. What words can be more expressly declaratory than these of the finite nature of the knowledge granted to Jesus, however its extent may actually surpass our limited capacity. As a proof that his judicial authority is derived from God, see *John* v. 26 and 27, "For as the Father hath life in himself, so *hath he given* to the Son to have life in himself; and *hath given him authority* to execute judgment also." 30, "I can of mine own self do nothing; as I hear, I judge; and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." Is it possible to misunderstand the assertion contained in these words, that both the authority and the ability to judge are gifts bestowed on the Son by the omnipotent Father?

The sixth position is, that in several instances, Jesus accepted worship "due to no man, but to God alone;" and instances of his receiving worship from a blind man, a leper, from mariners, and from his disciples, are adduced from the evangelical writings. —Every one must admit that the word "worship," both in common acceptation and in the Scriptural writings, is used sometimes as implying an external mark of religious reverence paid to God, and at other times, as signifying merely the token of civil respect due to superiors; and that concurrent circumstances in every instance determine the real sense in which the word should be taken. Among the Prophets of God, Jesus was not the only one that permitted himself to be worshipped, as we find Daniel the Prophet allowing himself such worship. *Daniel* ii. 46, "Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face, and worshipped Daniel." Daniel, like Jesus, neither rebuked the man who worshipped him, nor did he feel indignant at such a tribute of respect; yet we cannot find any subsequent assertion that he had offended God by suffering himself to be the object of the King's *worship* in this instance. Besides, Jesus himself uses the word worship in the latter sense, (I mean that of civil reverence) in one of the evangelical parables, where he represents a servant as worshipping his master. *Matthew* xviii. 26, "The servant therefore fell down and worshipped him." From the circumstance of Jesus positively commanding human beings to worship God alone in spirit, and not in any form or shape, either human or

angelic; as *John* iv. 24, "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." *Matthew* iv. 10, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." And from the circumstance of his rebuking the man who called him "good master," on the ground that the term "good" should be peculiarly applied to God alone, (*Matthew* xix. 66.) we necessarily conclude 17.
that Jesus accepted worship only as a mark of human respect and acknowledgment of gratitude. Let us moreover ascertain from the context, the sentiments which the blind man, the leper, the mariners, and the disciples of Jesus entertained of his nature; and we can no longer hesitate to believe, that they meant by the worship they offered only the manifestation of their reverence for him as a superior indeed, yet still as a created being. The question is; Did those that offered worship to Jesus evince that they believed him to be God, or one of the three persons of the Godhead, and equal to God? Nothing of the kind—the blind man after his cure spoke of Jesus as a Prophet, and a righteous man, and believed him when he said he was the Son of God. *John* ix. 31, "Now we know," (says the blind man), "that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth." 33, "If this man were not of God, he could do nothing." And in answer to the question of Jesus, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" he answers, "Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him."

38. The unclean spirit which is said in Mark to have worshipped Jesus, "Cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I *adjure thee by God,* that thou torment me not." *Mark,* v. 7. This adjuration would have been absurd if Jesus were himself addressed as God; and clearly shews, that the worship offered was to deprecate the power of a being whose nature was subordinate to that of God, by whose name he was adjured.—The leper, too, glorified God, while to Jesus he gave only thanks for being the instrument of his cure. *Luke* xvii. 15 and 16, "And one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God, and fell down on his face at his feet, *giving him thanks.*"—The mariners who worshipped Jesus declared at the same instant, "Of a truth thou art the Son of God." *Matthew* xiv. 33. The woman of Canaan, who is also stated in *Matthew* xv. 25, to have worshipped Jesus, addressed him, 22, as "the son of David," by which term she certainly would not have designated a being whom she worshipped as God. Peter, the most celebrated of his disciples, shewed his faith in acknowledging Jesus merely as the Christ, or in other words with the same exact sense, *the anointed* of God—which is certainly far from implying "very God." *Mark* viii. 9. Even after the crucifixion we find the disciples conversing of Jesus only as "a Prophet, mighty in deed and in word before God and all the people." *Luke* xxiv. 19. It was Jesus himself risen from the dead whom they addressed, yet throughout the re-

mainder of the chapter, which concludes with the account of his being carried up to heaven, they are only further taught that this Prophet was the promised Messiah, but by no means that it was their duty to worship him as God. Peter in the name of all the disciples declares, *John* vi. 69, "We believe and are sure that thou art Christ, the son of the living God." And as already observed, the disciple John declares, that the object of the Gospel is, "that it may be believed that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." *John* xx. 31. When the leper prayed to Jesus for cure, he addressed him only with the term κυριὸς (*Matthew* viii. 2,) which in Greek is used as synonymous to Lord or Master, and often applied to superior persons.

Every Christian is morally bound to evince obedience to the commandments of Jesus, and exert himself to follow his example. It behoves us therefore to ascertain, what his commandments are with regard to the object of sacred worship and prayer, and in what manner he himself performed those solemn religious duties. The very act of prayer indeed implies an acknowledgment of inferiority to the being adored; but though Trinitarians affirm that such devotion was paid by Jesus only in his human capacity, his form of prayer ought still to be sufficient to guide human creatures as to the Being to whom their prayers should be addressed. Let us examine therefore, whether Jesus in his acknowledged human capacity ever offered worship or prayer to what Tri-

nitarians term the second or third person of the Godhead, or once directed his followers to worship or pray to either of them. But so far from finding a single direction of the kind, we observe on the contrary, that Jesus strictly enjoins us to worship the Father alone in that form of prayer which he offered for our guidance. *Matthew* vi. 9, "After this manner therefore pray ye, *Our Father* which art in heaven, &c." "Pray to *thy Father* which is in secret: and *thy Father*, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly." In the same way, when the Saviour himself prays, he addresses the Father alone.—*Matthew* xxvi. 53, "Thinkest thou," says Jesus to Peter, "that I cannot now *pray to my Father*." *John* xvi. 26, "I will *pray the Father* for you." *Luke* xxii. 41 and 42, "And he (the Saviour) was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed, saying, *Father*, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me." *Mark* xiv. 35 and 36, "And fell on the ground, and prayed, that if it were possible the hour might pass from him. And he said, *Abba, Father*, all things are possible unto thee." Luke vi. 12, "He went out unto a mountain to pray, and continued all night *in prayer to God*." *Luke* x. 21, "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth." *John* xi. 41, "And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." xvii *Matthew* xxviii. 46, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" *John* iv. 22, "Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship." No creed drawn up by men, nor opinion entertained by

any sect, can by an unbiassed searcher after the true doctrines of Christianity be suffered to set aside the express authority and constant example of the gracious author of this religion.

The last position is, that Jesus associated his own name with that of God in the rite of baptism, intended to remain in force to the end of the world; and ordained by the passage, *Matthew* xix. 28, "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." A profession of belief in God is unquestionably common to all the religions supposed to have been founded upon the authority of the Old Testament; but each is distinguished from the other by a public profession of faith in their respective founders, expressing such profession in a language that may clearly exhibit the inferior nature of those founders to the divine Being, of whom they declare themselves the messengers. This system has been carried on from the first, and was no doubt intended to serve as a perpetual distinguishing mark of faith. The Jews claim that they have revelation, rendering a belief not in God alone, but in Moses also, incumbent upon them. *Exodus* xiv. 31, "The people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his servant Moses." But the term "his servant Moses," in this passage, suffices to prove the subordination of Moses, though declared, equally with God, to be an object of their belief. In like manner Mohummudans, in the first acknowledgment of that system of religion,

are directed to profess faith in God, and also in Mohummud, his messenger, in the following form: لااله الا الله محمد رسول الله "There is no God except the true God, Mohummud is his messenger." The term "his messenger" removes every doubt of Mohummud's identity or equality with God; so the epithet "Son" found in the passage, "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, &c." ought to be understood and admitted by every one as expressing the created nature of Christ, though the most highly exalted among all creatures. If baptism were administered to one embracing Christianity in the name of the Father and the Holy Ghost, he would thereby no more become enrolled as a Christian, than as a Jew or as a Mohummudan; for both of them, in common with Christians, would readily submit to be baptized in the name of God and his prevailing influence over the universe. But as Christianity requires peculiarly a faith in Jesus, as the promised Messiah, the gracious Saviour enjoins baptism in the name of *the Son* also, so as to distinguish his happy followers from the Jews and the rest of the people. A mere association of names in divine commandments therefore never can be considered as tending to prove identity or equality between the subjects of those names:—such junction of names is found frequently in the sacred writings without establishing unity among the persons whom those names imply.

The Editor quotes the following passage, *Matthew* xxviii. 18, "All power in heaven and earth is

delivered unto me," recommending it as a sure proof of the deity of Jesus.—I regret very much that the force of the expression "is delivered unto me," found in this passage, should have escaped the discerning notice of the Reverend Editor. Does not the term "delivered" shew evidently an entire dependence of Jesus upon the being, who has committed to him such power? Is it consistent with the nature of an omnipotent God to exercise power delivered to him by another being, or to confess that the power he possesses has been received by him from another?

As to the question of the Editor, "Did Mohummud, arrogant as he was, ever make such a declaration as Jesus did, namely, that 'I am with you always even to the end of the world?" I will not renew the subject, as it has been already discussed in examining the first position. I only entreat the attention of the Editor to the following assertions of Mohummud, known to almost all Moossulmans who have the least knowledge of their own religion. ان الله عزوجل بعثني رحمة وهدي للعالمين "Truly the great and glorious God raised me as *mercy* and *guidance* to *worlds*." كنت اول النبيين في الخلق واخرهم في البعث "I *was the first* of all Prophets in creation, and the last in appearance." كنت نبيا وادم في الماء والطين "I was a Prophet when Adam was in earth and water." انا سيد المرسلين ولا فخر فيه "I am the Lord of those that were sent by God. This is no boast to me."

انّما ظلّي علي روس امّتي "My shadow is on the head only of my followers."

من راءني فقد راء الله "He who has seen me has seen God."

من اطاعني فقد اطاع الله و من عصاني فعصي الله "He who has obeyed me, has obeyed God; and he who has sinned against me, has sinned against God."

It is however fortunate for Moossulmans, that from want of familiarity and intimate connection between the primitive Mohummuddans and their contemporary heathens, the doctrines of Monotheism taught by Mohummud, and entertained by his followers, have not been corrupted by polytheistical notions of pagans, nor have heathen modes of worship or festivals been introduced among Moossulmans of Arabia and Turkey as a part of their religion. Besides, metaphorical expressions having been very common among Oriental nations, Mohummuddans could not fail to understand them in their proper sense, although these expressions may throw great difficulty in the way of an European Commentator even of profound learning.

CHAPTER IV.

Inquiry into the doctrine of the atonement.

ALL the texts collected by the Reverend Editor in his review from the authority of the divine Teacher, in favour of the second important doctrine of the cross, implying the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus as an atonement for the sins of mankind, are as follow: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." "His giving his flesh for the life of the world." "I lay down my life for my sheep." "The Son of man is come to give his life a ransom for many." Is any one of these passages, I would ask, in the shape of an explicit commandment, or are they more than a mere statement of facts requiring figurative interpretation? For it is obvious that an attempt to take them in their direct sense, especially the first, ("I am the living bread;—if any man eat of this," &c.) would amount to gross absurdity.—Do they reasonably convey any thing more than the idea, that Jesus was invested with a divine commission to deliver instructions leading to eternal beatitude, which whosoever should receive should live for ever? And that the Saviour, foreseeing that the imparting of those instruc-

tions would, by exciting the anger and enmity of the superstitious Jews, cause his life to be destroyed, yet hesitated not to persevere in their promulgation—as if a king, who hazards his life to procure freedom and peace for his subjects, were to address himself to them, saying, "I lay down my life for you." This interpretation is fully confirmed by the following passages, *Luke* iv. 43, "And he said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also; *for therefore am I sent.*" ii. 47, 48 and 49, "And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they (his parents) saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy Father and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that *I must be about my Father's business?*" Wherein Jesus declares, that the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions. Again, after having instructed his disciples in all the divine law and will, as appears from the following text, "For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me;" (*John* xvii. 8.) Jesus in his communing with God manifests that he had completed the object of his mission by imparting divine commandments to mankind. "I have glorified thee on the earth, *I have*

finished the work which thou gavest me to do." Had his death on the cross been the work, or part of the work, for the performance of which Jesus was sent into this world, he as the founder of truth would not have declared himself to have finished that work prior to his death.

That Jesus should ride on a colt, should receive an offer of vinegar to drink, and should be wounded with a spear after he had delivered up the ghost, as well as his death on the cross, were events prophesied in the Old Testament, and consequently these were fulfilled by Jesus: vide *Luke* xxiv. 26 and 27, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." But we are unhappily at a loss to discover any other design in each of these events, which happened to Jesus before his ascent to heaven. I am therefore sorry that I must plead my inability to make a satisfactory reply to the question of the Editor, "Had ever Jesus transgressed his heavenly Father's will, that he underwent such afflictions?" I can only say, that we find in the scriptures that several other Prophets in common with Jesus suffered great afflictions, and some even death, as predicted. But I know not whether those afflictions were the consequences of the sins committed by them or by their parents, or whether these distresses were experienced by them

through some divine purpose unknown to us; as some scriptural authorities shew beyond doubt, that man may be made liable to sufferings for some secret divine purpose, without his or his parents having perpetrated any remarkable crime; (*John* x. 3, "Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him.") The latter alternative, (namely that the righteous Prophets suffered afflictions and even death for some divine purpose, known thoroughly to God alone), seems more consistent with the contents of the sacred writings, such as follows: *Mark* xii. 1 to 9, "And he began to speak unto them by parables. A certain man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a place for the wine fat, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country. And at the season he sent to the husbandmen a servant, that he might receive from the husbandmen of the fruit of the vineyard. And they caught him, and beat him, and sent him away empty. And again he sent unto them another servant; and at him they cast stones, and wounded him in the head, and sent him away shamefully handled. And again he sent another; and him they killed, and many others, beating some, and killing some. Having yet therefore one Son, his well-beloved, he sent him also last unto them, saying, They will reverence my Son. But these husbandmen said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inher

tance shall be ours. And they took him, and killed him, and cast him out of the vineyard. What shall therefore the Lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others." *John* xv. 21 and 22, "But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me. If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloke for their sin." This parable and these passages give countenance to the idea, that God suffered his prophets, and Jesus, his beloved Son, to be cruelly treated and slain by the Jews, for the purpose of taking away every excuse that they might offer for their guilt.

In explaining the objects of Jesus's death on the cross, the Editor confidently assumes, that "If we view Jesus Christ as atoning for the sins of men, we have every thing perfectly in character: he became incarnate to accomplish that which could have been effected by neither men nor angels." I should therefore wish to know whether Jesus, whom the Editor represents as God incarnate, suffered death and pain for the sins of men in his divine nature, or in his human capacity? The former must be highly inconsistent with the nature of God, which, we are persuaded to believe by reason and tradition, is above being rendered liable to death or pain; since the difference we draw between God, and the objects that are not God, is, that one cannot be subjected to death or

termination, and the other is finite and liable to mortality. That the effects of Christ's appearance on earth, whether with respect to the salvation or condemnation of mankind, were finite, and therefore suitable to the nature of a finite being to accomplish, is evident from the fact, that to the present time millions of human beings are daily passing through the world, whom the doctrines he taught have never reached, and who of course must be considered as excluded from the benefit of his having died for the remission of their sins. The latter, namely, that Jesus suffered death and pain in his human capacity as an atonement for the offences of others, seems totally inconsistent with the justice ascribed to God, and even at variance with those principles of equity required of men; for it would be a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being who had all the human feelings, and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross for the crimes committed by others, especially when he declares such great aversion to it, as is manifest from the following passages. *Matthew* xxvi. 37, 39, 42 and 43, " And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. And prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup (meaning death) pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will

be done." *Mark* xiv. 36, "And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt." *Luke* xxii. 42 and 44, "Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground." *John* xii. 27, "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour." Do not these passages evidently shew, that Jesus in his human capacity, (according to the Trinitarian phrase) felt averse to death and pain, and that he earnestly prayed that he might not be subjected to it? Jesus however, knowing that the will of the Father rendered such death unavoidable, yielded to it as predicted. *John* xi. 17 and 18, "Therefore doth my Father *love me*, because *I lay down my life* that I might take it again: no *man* taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself; I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it *again:* this *commandment have I received of my Father*." *Matthew* xxvi. 53 and 54, "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the scripture be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" The iniquity of one's being sentenced to death as an atonement for the fault committed by another is so palpable, that although in many countries the human

race think themselves justified in detaining the persons of those men who, voluntarily making themselves responsible for the debt or the persons of others, fail to fulfil their engagements; nevertheless, every just man among them would shudder at the idea of one's being put to death for a crime committed by another, even if the innocent man should willingly offer his life in behalf of that other.

In endeavouring to prove Jesus's atonement for sin by his death, the Reverend Editor urges, "Is he called the Saviour of men because he gave them moral precepts, by obeying which they might obtain the divine favor, with the enjoyment of heaven as their just desert? or, because he died in their stead to atone for their sins and procure for them every blessing, &c.? If Jesus be termed a Saviour merely because he instructed men, he has this honor in common with Moses and Elijah and John the Baptist, neither of whom however assumed the title of Saviour." We find the title "Saviour" applied frequently in the divine writings to those persons who had been endued with the power of saving people, either by inculcating doctrines, or affording protection to them, although none of them atoned for the sins of mankind by their death. *Obadiah* 21, "And *saviours* shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the Lord's." *Nehemiah* ix. 27, "And according to thy manifold mercies thou gavest them *saviours*, who saved them

out of the hand of their enemies." 2*d Kings* xiii. 5, " The Lord gave Israel a *saviour*, so that they went out from under the hand of the Syrians." How could therefore the Editor, a diligent student of the Bible, lay such stress upon the application of the term " Saviour" to Jesus, as to adduce it as a proof of the doctrine of atonement; especially when Jesus himself declares frequently, that he saved the people solely through the inculcation of the word of God? *John* xv. 3, " Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." v. 24, " He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." vi. 63, " The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life :"—wherein Jesus represents himself as a Saviour, or a distributer of eternal life, in his capacity of divine teacher.

Jesus is of course justly termed and esteemed a Saviour, for having instructed men in the divine will and law never before so fully revealed. Would it degrade Jesus to revere him as a divine teacher, because Moses and the Prophets before him delivered to the people divine instructions? or would it depreciate the dignity of Jesus, to believe that he in common with several other Prophets underwent afflictions and death? Such an idea is indeed unscriptural, for God represents the Christ as a Prophet equal to Moses (*Deuteronomy* xviii. 18.); Jesus declares himself to have come to fulfil the law taught by Mo-

ses, (*Matthew* v. 17.) "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfil;" and strictly commands his disciples and the people at large to obey whatever Moses had taught. xxiii. 2 and 3, "Saying, The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not."

I am sorry that I cannot, without offending my conscience, agree with the Reverend Editor in the opinion, that "If Jesus be esteemed merely a teacher, the greater degree of honor must be given to Moses, for it was in reality his Law that Jesus explained and established."

It is true that Moses began to erect the everlasting edifice of true religion, consisting of a knowledge of the unity of God, and obedience to his will and commandments; but Jesus of Nazareth has completed the structure, and rendered his law perfect. To convince the Editor of this fact, I beg to call his attention to the following instances found even in a single chapter, as exhibiting the perfection to which Jesus brought the Law given by Moses and other Prophets: *Matthew* v. 21 and 22, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, That

whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." 27 and 28, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery." 31 and 32, "It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: but I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery." 38 and 39, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." 43, 44 and 45, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.—Now I hope I may be justified in expressing my belief, (though it varies from the declaration made by the Editor,) that no *greater* honor can be justly given to any teacher of the will of God than what is

due to the *author* of the doctrines just quoted, which, with a power no less than standing miracles could produce, carry with them proofs of their divine origin to the conviction of the high and low, the learned and unlearned.

The Editor in page 101, lays much stress on circumstances, the very minuteness of which, he thinks, " serves to enhance their value as testimonies." He alludes to the epithet " Lamb of God" having been twice applied to Jesus by John the Baptist, two of whose disciples were thereby induced to become followers of Jesus. This is considered by the Editor as implying an admission on the part of Christ, that as a lamb, particularly the Paschal Lamb, was used in sacrifice as an atonement for sins, he also came into the world to sacrifice his life as an atonement for sin. We find however the term " lamb," as well as " sheep," applied in other places, where no allusion to the sacrificial lamb can be well imagined, and from which we infer that these were epithets generally applied to innocence subjected to persecution; a meaning which sufficiently accords with the use of the word lamb in the instance in question. We have those terms applied by Jesus to his disciples in *John* xxi. 15, 16 and 17, where he commands Simon Peter " to feed his lambs," " to feed his sheep;" and in x. 26 and 27, " Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep"—"My sheep hear my voice."—Now many of the Apostles suffered death in consequence

of their endeavours to withdraw men from sin; but the Editor will not thence, I presume, maintain, though it follow from his argument, that the term "lamb" was applied to them, to shew that by their death, they also atoned for the sins of mankind. The Reverend Editor might have spared the arguments he has adduced to prove, that Jesus was sent into this world as the long-expected Messiah, intended to suffer death and difficulties like other Prophets who went before him; as the Editor may find in the compilation in question, as well as in its defence, Jesus of Nazareth represented as "The Son of God," a term synonymous with that of Messiah, the highest of all the Prophets; and his life declares him to have been, as represented in the Scriptures, pure as light, innocent as a lamb, necessary for eternal life as bread for a temporal one, and great as the angels of God, or rather greater than they. He also might have omitted to quote such authority as shews, that Christ, being a mediator between God and men, "declared that whatsoever they (his Apostles) shall ask in his name, the Father will give them." For the Compiler in his defence of the Precepts of Jesus repeatedly acknowledged Christ as the Redeemer, Mediator, and Intercessor with God, in behalf of his followers. But such intercession does not, I presume, tend to a proof of the deity or the atonement of Jesus, as interpreted by the Editor; for God is represented in the sacred books to have often shewn mercy to mankind for righteous men's sakes; how

much more then would he naturally manifest his favor towards those who might petition him in the name of one, whom he anointed and exalted over all creatures and Prophets? *Genesis* xxx. 27, "I have learned by experience, that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake." *Jeremiah* xxvii. 18, "But if they be Prophets, and if the word of the Lord be with them, let them now make intercession to the Lord of hosts." Moreover, we find angels declared to have been endued with the power of pardoning and redeeming men on various occasions. *Genesis* xlviii. 16, "The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads!" *Exodus* xxiii. 20 and 21, "Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him."

With regard to this doctrine I have carefully noticed every argument advanced by the Editor, from the authority of Jesus himself, in its support; and have adduced such arguments as may be used by those that reject that doctrine, and which they rest on the authority of the same divine Teacher; leaving the decision of the subject to the discreet judgment of the public, but declining to deliver any opinion as an individual as to the merits thereof.

CHAPTER V.

On the doctrines and miraculous narrations of the New Testament.

I REGRET that the Editor should have accused the Compiler of having charged "on the dogmas or doctrines of Christianity those wars and that bloodshed which have occurred between nations merely termed Christians." The Compiler in his defence of the Precepts of Jesus has ascribed such disputes and contentions not to any thing contained in the Scriptures, but to the different interpretations of dogmas, which he esteemed not essential for salvation. In order to convince the Editor of the accuracy of my assertion, I intreat his attention to page 18, line 22, and page 22, line 24, of my defence of the compiled Precepts, under the designation of "An Appeal to the Christian Public."

The Editor observes, that "wars and bloodshed existed before the promulgation of Christianity in the world; neither Christianity therefore nor its dogmas created the causes of wars and bloodshed. They existed in the human mind long before its doctrines were published;" and that "quarrels and feuds between the Arians and the orthodox in the fourth and the fifth

centuries were little more than struggles for power and wealth." Although human frailty and want of perfection in men are in fact esteemed as the first and original causes of their improper conduct and wicked deeds, yet in the ordinary acceptation of the term "cause," good or evil acts are invariably attributed to their immediate motives, ascertained from circumstantial evidence; and these acts are consequently held to entitle their respective agents to praise or reproach.—But as the motives of actions and the secrets of the human heart are in truth known to God alone, it is indeed beyond my power to establish in a satisfactory manner, that the majority of the primitive Arians and Trinitarians were excited by their mistaken religious zeal to slay each other, and not by a desire of power and wordly advancement—I would appeal however to the Editor himself, whether it would not be indeed very illiberal to suppose, that almost all the Christian world should for a period of two hundred years have been weak or wicked enough to engage wilfully in causing the blood of each other to be shed under the cloak of religion, and merely for worldly motives.—But as this must be a matter of opinion, I beg to shew that which has been entertained on the subject by one of the highest authorities amongst the Trinitarians who have written on the history of Christianity. I allude to Dr. Mosheim, whose words I here give, and I entreat my readers to draw their own inferences from them.

Volume 1st, page 419—"After the death of Constantine the Great, one of his sons Constantius, who in the division of the empire became ruler of the East, was warmly attached to the Arian party, whose principles were also zealously adopted by the Empress, and indeed by the whole Court. On the other hand Constantine and Constantius, Emperors of the West, maintained the decrees of the Council of Nice throughout all the provinces between the two contending parties.—Hence arose endless animosities and seditions, treacherous plots, and open acts of injustice and violence between the two contending parties: Council was assembled against Council, and their jarring and contradictory decrees spread perplexity and confusion throughout the Christian world." Page 420, "His (Gratian's) zeal for their interest, though fervent and active, was surpassed by that of his successor Theodosius the Great, who raised the secular arm against the Arians with a terrible degree of violence, drove them from their churches, and enacted laws, whose severity exposed them to the greatest calamities." It is difficult to conceive what other motives than those of mistaken zeal for a particular doctrine could have influenced the mind of an Emperor like Theodosius to such acts of cruelty and violence—but however that may be, it is obvious that if such a mode of interpreting conduct be adopted, it is difficult to say where we are to stop. The devotion even of the Apostles and Martyrs of Christianity may be attributed to a pursuit after power over the minds

and respect in the eyes of men, and all distinction of good and evil character be considered as futile and without foundation. With respect to the final success of the Trinitarian party, it appears to me the event naturally to have been expected. For to the people of those ages, doctrines that resembled the polytheistical belief that till then prevailed, must have been more acceptable than those which were diametrically opposed to such notions. The idea of a God in human form was easy and familiar: Emperors and Empresses had altars raised to them even during their lives, and after death were enrolled as divinities. Perhaps too something may justly be attributed to a certain degree of pride and satisfaction in the idea, that the religion they had begun to profess was dictated immediately by the Deity himself, rather than by any subordinate agency. There had not been among the Heathens any class of mankind to whom they were accustomed to look up with that devotion familiarly entertained by the Jews towards Moses and their Prophets, and they were consequently ready to elevate to a God any being who rose in their estimation above the level of mankind.

The violence and outrages which Roman Catholics and Protestants have experienced from each other were not of course, as observed by the Reverend Editor, owing in their origin to the adoption of different interpretations respecting the deity of Christ or of the Holy Ghost; but they were the immediate

consequences of the different sentiments they have held with respect to the doctrine of an exclusive power of granting absolution, and leading to eternal life, being vested in St. Peter and his successors. What great mischief has however been produced, and how many lives have from time to time been destroyed, from the difference of sentiments held by the parties with regard to this doctrine, which even the Editor himself does not deem an essential point of religion!

The Editor in p. 114. argues, as a proof of the importance of the doctrines of the Gospel, that Christ taught them, fully foreseeing that they would be the subject of dispute; and quotes his saying, that he came not to send peace on the earth, but a sword. The whole of the 10th chap. of Matthew, from which the Editor quotes the passage here alluded to, consists of the instructions delivered by Jesus to the twelve Apostles, when he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of heaven to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; but has no allusion, that I can perceive, to eternal dissensions amongst those who were already or might afterwards become Christians. That Jesus foresaw, as one of the primary effects of preaching his Gospel, that great dissensions would arise—that he was aware that the great question of confessing him to be the Messiah or not would be as a sword between a man and his father, the daughter and her mother, and the daughter-in-law and her mother-in-law, is evident. But this seems to me by no means to prove that Jesus, as sup-

posed by the Editor, "longed or almost longed" to see a fire kindled in the earth respecting doctrines not essential to the salvation of mankind. Nor would it have been any reason for suppressing the most trivial of his sayings, that priestcraft working on the ignorance and superstition, the bigotry or intolerance of mankind, should have wrested his words to evil purposes.—As observed by the Editor himself, the mischief lay originally in human nature, not in any part of the doctrines of Christ; but as those dissensions are now perpetuated principally by education, a cause essentially distinct from their origin, the case is entirely altered. The corruption of the human heart cannot be totally removed; but the evil effects that spring from human institutions may be avoided, when their real sources are known. After the secret and immediate causes of persecution have passed away, the differences of opinion which have been the declared grounds of hostility are handed down by the teachers of different sects; and, as already repeatedly avowed, it was with the view of evading, not those questions concerning which Jesus spoke and which distinguish his followers from all others, but those which have from time to time been seized upon to excite enmities still existing amongst fellow Christians, that the Compiler confined himself to those Precepts, concerning which all mankind must be of one accord.

As to the question of the Editor, "It can scarcely be unknown to the Compiler, that the very being of a God has been for numerous ages the subject of dispute among the most learned of his own country; does he account this a sufficient reason for suppressing this doctrine? We know that he does not. Why then should he omit the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, because men have made them the subject of dispute?" For a direct answer to this question I beg to refer the Reverend Editor to the Appeal of the Compiler, page 27, wherein he will find that he assigns not one, but two circumstances, as concurring to form the motive of his having omitted certain doctrines of Christianity in his selection—1st, that they are the subject of disputes and contention.—2ndly, that they are not essential to religion. It is therefore obvious, that the analogy between the omission of certain dogmas, and that of the being of a God, has been unfairly drawn by the Editor. Admitting that the doctrines of Christianity and the existence of a God are equally liable to disputes, it should be recollected that the former are, in the estimation of the Compiler, not essential to religion; while the latter is acknowledged by him, in common with the professors of every faith, to be the foundation of all religion, as distinctly stated in his Introduction to the selected Precepts of Jesus. Every system of religion adopts the idea of a God, and avows this as its fundamental principle, though they differ from one another in representing the nature

and attributes of the Deity. The Compiler therefore could have no motive for suppressing the doctrine of the being of a God, though disputed by a few pretended literary men; and he has consequently never hesitated to inculcate with all his power the idea of one God to the learned and unlearned of his own country, taking care at the same time as much as possible not to enter into particulars as to the real nature, essence, attributes, person, or substance of the Godhead, those being points above his comprehension, and liable to interminable disputes. The Reverend Editor thus expresses his surprize at the conduct of the Compiler, in omitting in his selection the miraculous relations of the Gospel:—"We cannot but wonder that his miracles should not have found greater favor in the eyes of the Compiler of this selection, while the amazing weight which Jesus himself attached to them could scarcely have escaped his notice:" and in order to prove the importance of the miracles ascribed to Jesus, the Editor quotes three instances, in the first of which Jesus referred John the Baptist to his wonderful miracles; in the second, he called the attention of unbelieving Jews to his miraculous works as a proof of his divine mission; in the third, he recommends Philip the Apostle to the evidence of his miracles. But after a slight attention to the circumstances in which those appeals were made, it appears clearly, that in these and other instances Jesus referred to his miracles those persons only who either *scrupled to believe*, or doubted him as the promised

Messiah, or required of him some sign to confirm their faith. *Vide Mat.* xi. 2, 3 and 4, "When John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, and said unto him, Art thou he that should come, or do we *look for another?* Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and shew John those things which ye do hear and see." *John* x. 37 and 38, Jesus says to those Jews who accused him of blasphemy, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But *if I do*, though ye believe not me, *believe the works.*" In reply to the request of Philip, who, being discontented with the doctrines Jesus inculcated, said, "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us;" Jesus answered and said, "Believe me, that I am in the Father and the Father in me, *or else* believe me for the very works' sake." (*John* xiv. 11.) Jesus even speaks in terms of reproach of those that seek for miracles for their conviction as to his divine mission. *Matthew* xii. 39, "But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign." Moreover he blesses them, who, without having recourse to the proofs of miracles, profess their belief on him. *John* xx. 29, "Jesus said unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; *blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.*"

Under these circumstances, and from the experience that nothing but the sublimity of the Precepts of Jesus had at first drawn the attention of the

Compiler himself towards Christianity, and excited his veneration for the author of this religion, without aid from miraculous relations, he omitted in his compilation the mention of the miracles performed by Jesus, without meaning to express doubts of their authenticity, or intending to slight them by such an omission.

I regret therefore, that the Editor should have suffered any part of his valuable time to be spent in advancing several arguments, in the concluding part of his Review, to establish the truth of the miraculous statements of the New Testament. But as this discussion applies to the evidence of miracles generally, it may be worth considering. Arguments adduced by the Editor amount to this: "If all social, political, mercantile, and judicial transactions be allowed to rest upon testimony; why should not the validity of Christian miracles be concluded from the testimony of the Apostles and of others, and be relied upon by all the nations of the world." The Editor must be well aware, that the enemies to revelation draw a line of distinction on the subject of proofs by testimony, between the current events of nature familiar to the senses of mankind, and within the scope of human exertions; and extraordinary facts beyond the limits of common experience, and ascribed to a direct interposition of divine power suspending the usual course of nature. If all assertions were to be indiscriminately admitted as facts, merely because

they are testified by numbers, how can we dispute the truth of those miracles which are said to have been performed by persons esteemed holy amongst natives of this country? The Compiler has never placed the miracles related in the New Testament on a footing with the extravagant tales of his countrymen, but distinctly expressed his persuasion that they (Christian miracles) would be apt at best to carry little weight with those whose imaginations had been accustomed to dwell on narrations much more wonderful, and supported by testimony which they have been taught to regard with a reverence that they cannot be expected all at once to bestow on the Apostles. See Introduction to the Precepts, p. 4, and Appeal, p. 17. The very same line of argument indeed pursued by the Editor would equally avail the Hindoos. Have they not accounts and records handed down to them relating to the wonderful miracles stated to have been performed by their saints, such as Ugustyu, Vuhistu, and Gotum; and their Gods incarnate, such as Ram, Krishnu, and Nursingh; in presence of their contemporary friends and enemies, the wise and the ignorant, the select and the multitude?—Could not the Hindoos quote in support of their narrated miracles, authorities from the histories of their most inveterate enemies the Jeins, who join the Hindoos entirely in acknowledging the truth and credibility of their miraculous accounts? The only difference which subsists between these two parties on this subject, is, that the Hindoos consider the power of

performing miracles given to their Gods and Saints by the Supreme Deity, and the Jeins declare that they performed all those astonishing works by *Asooree Shukti*, or by demoniac power. Moossulmans on the other hand can produce records written and testified by cotemporaries of Mohummud, both friends and enemies, who are represented as eye-witnesses of the miracles ascribed to him; such as his dividing the moon into two parts, and walking in sunshine without casting a shadow. They can assert too, that several of those witnesses suffered the greatest calamities, and some even death, in defence of that religion; some before the attempts of Mohummud at conquest, others after his commencing such attempts, and others after his death. On mature consideration of all those circumstances the Compiler hopes he may be allowed to remain still of opinion, that the miraculous relations found in the divine writings would be apt at best to carry little weight with them, when imparted to the Hindoos at large in the present state of their minds: but as no other religion can produce any thing that may stand in competition with the Precepts of Jesus, much less that can be pretended to be superior to them, the Compiler deemed it incumbent upon him to introduce these among his countrymen as a Guide to Peace and Happiness.

CHAPTER VI.

On the Impersonality of the Holy Spirit. Miscellaneous remarks.

I WILL now enquire into the justness of the conclusion drawn by the Editor in his attempt to prove the deity of the Holy Ghost, from the circumstance of his name being associated with that of the Father in the rite of Baptism. This subject is incidentally brought forward in the course of the arguments he has adduced respecting the nature of Jesus, where he observes, "It is needless to add that this testimony of Jesus, (the associating of his own name and that of the Holy Ghost with the name of the Father,) is equally decisive respecting the deity of the Holy Ghost." I have hitherto omitted to notice this question among other matters in review, reserving it for the express purpose of a distinct and separate examination. It seems to me in the first place rather singular, that the Reverend Editor, after having filled up many pages with numerous arguments in his endeavour to establish the Godhead of Jesus, should have noticed in so short and abrupt a manner, the question of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, although the Editor equally esteems them both as distinct

persons of the Deity. I wonder in the next place, how the learned Editor could suppose a mere association of names in a rite to be sufficient to prove the identity of their subjects. I am indeed sorry I cannot, without overlooking a great many scriptural authorities, and defying reason totally, join the Editor in the opinion, that the association of the name of the Holy Spirit with that of the Father of the Universe in the rite of Baptism, is "decisive" of, or even allusive to the separate personality of the Spirit.

2*d Chronicles*, xx. 20, "Jehoshaphat stood and said, Hear me, O Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem; Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper:" wherein the name of the Prophets of God is associated with that of the Deity himself in the profession of belief, which is considered by Christians of all denominations more essential than an external symbol of Christianity. Again, in *Jeremiah* xxx. 9, "But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their King, whom I will raise up unto them," the Lord joins his name with that of David in the act of religious service, which is in its strictest sense esteemed due to God alone. Would it not therefore be unscriptural to make an attempt to prove the Deity of the Prophets, or David, under the plea that their names are associated with that of God in religious observances? But we must do so, were we to follow the process of reasoning adopted by the Reverend Edi-

tor. The kind of evidence on which the Editor relies in this instance, would besides suit admirably the purposes of those who might seek in the sacred scriptures, grounds for justifying idolatry. Fire worshippers, for instance, insisting on the literal sense of the words, might refer to that text in the 3d chapter of Matthew repeated in *Luke* iii. 16. in which it is announced, that Jesus Christ will baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. If the association in the rite of Baptism of the names of the Son and Holy Ghost, with that of the Father, proves their divinity; it is clear, that fire also, being associated with the Holy Ghost in the same rite, must likewise be considered as a part of the Godhead.

God is invariably represented in revelation as the main object of belief, receiving worship and prayers that proceed from the heart through the first-born of every creature, the Messiah, ("No man cometh unto the Father but by me," *John* xiv. 6,) and leading such as worship him in spirit to righteous conduct, and ultimately to salvation, through his guiding influence which is called the Holy Spirit, ("when he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth," *John* xvi. 13.) There is therefore a moral obligation on those who avow the truth of such revelation to profess their belief in God as the sole object of worship, and in the Son through whom they, as Christians, should offer divine homage, and also in the Holy influence of God, from which they should expect

direction in the path of righteousness, as the consequence of their sincere prayer and supplication. For the same reason also, in publicly adopting this religion, it is proper that those who receive it should be baptized in the name of the Father, who is the object of worship; of the Son, who is the mediator; and of that influence by which spiritual blessings are conveyed to mankind, designated in the Scriptures as the Comforter, Spirit of truth, or Holy Spirit. As God is declared through his Holy Spirit to have led to righteousness such as sought heartily his will, so he is equally represented to have through his wrath afflicted rebels against his authority, and to have prospered through his infinite mercy those who manifested obedience to him; as appears from the following passages:—2*dKings* xxiv. 20, "For through the *anger* of the Lord it came to pass in Jerusalem, until he had cast them out from his presence." *Psalm* xc. 7, "For we are consumed by thine *anger*, and by thy *wrath* are we troubled." *Psalm* xxi. 7, "And through the *mercy* of the Most High he shall not be moved." *Psalm* vi. 4, "Return, O Lord, deliver my soul: O save me for thy *mercy's* sake." Nor can we legitimately infer the idea of the self-existence or distinct personality of the Holy Ghost, from such metaphorical language as the following, "The Holy Ghost shall teach you," *Luke* xii. 12. "The Holy Ghost is come upon you," *Acts* i. 8. "The Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send," *John* xiv. 26. For we find expressions of a similar nature

applied to other attributes of God, personifying them equally with the Holy Spirit. *Psalm* lvii. 3, "God shall *send* forth his *mercy* and his *truth*." lxxxv. 10, "*Mercy* and *truth* are *met* together." c. 5, "The Lord is good, his *mercy* is *everlasting*." xxxiii. 22, "Let thy *mercy*, O Lord, be upon us." xxxvi. 5, "Thy *mercy*, O Lord, is in the heavens." cviii. 4, "For thy *mercy* is great above the heavens." *Ezek*. vii. 3, "I will *send* my *anger* upon thee." 2*d Chronicles* xxiv. 18, "*Wrath* came upon Judah for this trespass."

Were every attribute ascribed to the Deity, which is found personified, to be therefore considered as a distinct personage, it would be difficult to avoid forming a very strange notion of the theology of the Bible. It appears indeed to me impossible to view the Holy Spirit as very God, without coming to ideas respecting the nature of the Deity, little different from some of those most generally and justly condemned as found amongst Polytheists. Take for instance, *Matthew* i. 11, where it is said, that Mary was found with child of the Holy Ghost. 20, "That which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost." *Luke* i. 35, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." In interpreting these passages according to the opinion maintained by the Editor, we should necessarily be drawn to the idea that God came upon Mary, and that the child which she bore was in reality begotten of him.—Is this idea, I would

beg to know, consistent with the perfect nature of the righteous God? Or rather, is not such a notion of the Godhead's having had intercourse with a human female, as horrible as the sentiments entertained by ancient and modern heathens respecting the Deity? On the other hand, if we understand by those passages, merely that the miraculous influence of God came upon Mary, so that, though a virgin, she bore a child, every thing would stand consistent with our belief of the divine power, without shocking our ideas of the purity of the Deity, inculcated alike by reason and revelation. This mode of interpretation is indeed confirmed by the very passage of *Luke* above quoted, "The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee;" plainly and simply declaring, that it was the power of God which gave birth to the child, contrary to the ordinary course of nature. If by the term "Holy Ghost" be meant a third distinct person of the Godhead, equal in power and glory with the Father of all; I am at a loss to know what Trinitarians understand by such expressions as the following: *Matthew* iii. 11, and *Luke* iii. 16, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." *Acts* x. 38, "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." *Matthew* xii. 28, "I cast out devils by the Spirit of God." 31, "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." *Luke* iv. 1, "And Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan."

If the term "Holy Ghost" be synonimous with the third person of the Godhead, and "Christ" with the second person, the foregoing passages may be read as follows: "He, the second person, shall baptize you with the third person of the Godhead, and with fire." "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth (the second person of the Godhead) with the third person of the Godhead, and with power." I (the second person of the Godhead) cast out devils by the third person of the Godhead." "All manner of sin and blasphemy, even against the first and second persons of the Godhead, shall be forgiven unto men; but blasphemy against the third person of the Godhead shall not be forgiven unto men." "Jesus (the second person of the Godhead) being full of the third person of the Godhead, returned from Jordan." But little reflection is, I should suppose, necessary to enable any one to perceive the inconsistency of such paraphrases as the foregoing, and the reasonableness of adopting the usual mode of scriptural interpretation of the original texts, according to which the foregoing passages may be understood as follows: "He shall baptize you with the spirit of truth and purity." "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with his holy influence and power." "I cast out devils by the influence of God." "All manner of sin and blasphemy even against the Christ, the first-born of every creature, shall be forgiven to men; but blasphemy against the power of God shall not be forgiven unto men." "Jesus being full

of the influence of God returned from Jordan." Still more dangerous to true religion would it be to interpret, according to the Trinitarian mode, the passages which describe the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus on the occasion of his baptism. *Luke* iii. 22, "And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him." For if we believe that the Spirit, in the form of a dove, or in any other *bodily shape*, was really the third person of the Godhead, how can we justly charge with absurdity the Hindoo legends of the divinity having the form of a fish or of any other animal?

It ought to be remarked, with respect to the text above quoted, denouncing eternal wrath on those who blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, that the occasion on which the term was made use of by Christ was the accusation of the Jews, that his miracles were the effects of an influence of a nature directly opposite to that of God, namely, the power of Beelzebub, the Prince of Devils. The Jews alleged that he was possessed of an unclean or diabolical spirit, ("Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit;" *Mark* iii. 30. "They said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils," *Matthew* xii. 24.) Jesus affirms, that the Spirit which enabled him to do those wonderful works was a holy Spirit; and that whatever language they might hold with respect to himself, blas-

phemy against that power by which he did those miracles would not be forgiven. "All manner of sins and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come."

Were the words "all manner of blasphemy," in the passage in question received as including blasphemy against the Father, the text must be thus understood, "All manner of blasphemy against man and the Father, and even blasphemy against the Son, shall be forgiven; but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost must not be forgiven:" and consequently the interpretation would amount to an admission of the superiority of the Son and the Holy Ghost to the Father, an opinion which no sect of Christians has hitherto formed. In the above quoted passage therefore, the exception of the Holy Ghost must exclude blasphemy against the Father, and the whole should be thus interpreted:—All manner of blasphemy against men and angels, even against the first-born of every creature, shall be forgiven; but blasphemy against the power of God, by which Jesus declared himself to have cast out devils, shall not be forgiven. For further illustration I quote here the whole passage of *Matthew* xii. 24 to 37, "But when the Pharisees

heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand. And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad. Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit. O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bring-

eth forth evil things. But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." *Mark* iii. 29 and 30, "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation: because they said, He hath an unclean spirit."

Is it not evident from the above authority of Jesus himself, that the term "Holy Ghost" is synonymous to the prevailing influence of God? and had not the power by which Jesus performed his miracles the same origin, and was it not of the same nature as that by which the children of Israel performed theirs? "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out; therefore they shall be your judges." It may not be without use to notice here, that frequent instances are related in the scriptures of the influence of the Spirit of God, in leading righteous men to truth, before Jesus had commenced the performance of his divine commission, and even before he had appeared in this world; in the same manner as it afterwards operated in guiding his true followers to the way of God, subsequent to his ascent to heaven, in consequence of his repeated intercession with the Father? This will fully appear from the following passages, *Luke* i. 15, "And he (John the Baptist) shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb."

41, "And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost." 67, "And his (John's) father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, &c." ii. 25, 26, "And, behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon; and the same man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel; and the Holy Ghost was upon him. And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ. And he came by the Spirit into the temple." *Mark* xii. 36, "David himself said by the Holy Ghost, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool." The Evangelist Matthew employs a similar expression, xxii. 43, "How then doth David in spirit call him Lord?" *Luke* iv. 1, "And Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost. returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness." It must not therefore be supposed, that the manifestation of this holy attribute of God is peculiar to the Christian dispensation. We find in the scriptures the term "God" applied figuratively in a finite sense to Christ, and to some other superiors, as I have already noticed in page 26:—a circumstance which may possibly have tended to confirm such as are rendered from their early impressions partial to the doctrine of the Trinity, in their prepossessed notions of the deity of Jesus. But with respect to the Holy

Ghost, I must confess my inability to find a single passage in the whole scriptures, in which the Spirit is addressed as God, or as a person of God, so as to afford to believers of the Trinity an excuse for their profession of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost. The only authorities they quote to this effect that I have met with are as follow: *Acts* v. 3 and 4, "Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." From which they conclude, He that lieth to the Holy Ghost, lieth to God. *John* xv. 26, "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." As to the first of these texts, I need only remark, that any sin or blasphemy against one of the attributes of God is of course reckoned a sin or blasphemy against God himself. But this admission amounts neither to a recognition of the self-existence of the attribute, nor of its identity with God. With respect to the mission of the Spirit of truth as a proof of its being a separate existence, and not merely an expression for the influence of God, the passage in question if so taken would thus run; "But when God is come, whom I (God) will send unto you from God, even God who proceedeth from God, &c." Can there be an idea more polytheistical than what flows from these words? yet those that maintain this interpretation, express their detestation of polytheism. If with a view to soften

the unreasonableness of this interpretation they think themselves justified in having recourse to the term "mystery," they cannot without injustice accuse Hindoos, the believers of numerous Gods under one Godhead, of absurdity, when they plead mystery in defence of their polytheism; for under the plea of mystery every appearance of unreasonableness may be easily removed.

I find to my great surprize, that the plural form of expression in verse the 26th of the first chapter of Genesis, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," has been quoted by some Divines as tending to prove the doctrine of the deity of the Holy Ghost, and that of the Son with the deity of the Father of the universe, commonly called the doctrine of the Trinity. It could scarcely be believed, if the fact were not too notorious, that such eminent scholars as some of those divines undoubtedly were could be liable to such a mistake, as to rely on this verse as a ground of argument in support of the Trinity. It shews how easily prejudice in favour of an already acquired opinion gets the better of learning, and how successfully it darkens the sphere of truth. Were we even to disregard totally the idiom of the Hebrew, Arabic, and of almost all Asiatic languages, in which the plural number is often used for the singular, to express the respect due to the person denoted by the noun; and to understand the term "our image" "and our likeness," found in the

verse as conveying a plural meaning, the quotation would still by no means answer their purpose; for the verse in question would in that case imply a plurality of Gods, without determining whether their number was three or three hundred, and of course without specifying their persons—No middle point in the unlimited series of number being determined, it would be almost necessary for the purpose of obtaining some fixed number, as implied by those terms, to adopt either two, the lowest degree of plurality in the first personal pronoun both in Hebrew and Arabic, or to take the highest number of Gods with which human imagination has peopled the heavens. In the former case the verse cited might countenance the doctrine of the duality of the Godhead entertained by Zirdusht and his followers, representing the God of goodness, and the God of evil, to have jointly created man, composed of a mixed nature of good and evil propensities; in the latter it would be consistent with the Hindoo sytem of religion: but there is nothing in the words that can be with any justice construed as pointing to Trinity. These are not the only difficulties attending the interpretation of those terms:—if they should be viewed in any other than a singular sense, they would involve contradiction with the very next verse, "So God created man in his own image," in which the singular number is distinctly used; and in *Deut.* iv. 4, "The Lord our God is one Lord;" and also with the spirit of the whole of the Old Testament.

To those who are tolerably versed in Hebrew and Arabic, (which is only a refined Hebrew) it is a well known fact, that in the Jewish and Mohummudan scriptures, as well as in common discourse, the plural form is often used in a singular sense when the superiority of the subject of discourse is intended to be kept in view: this is sufficiently apparent from the following quotations taken both from the Old Testament in Hebrew, and from the Qoran. *Exodus* xxi. 4, In the original Hebrew Scripture אם אדניו יתן לו אשה "If his masters (meaning his master) have given him a wife." Verse 6th, Hebrew והגישו אדניו אל האלהים "Then his masters (that is, his master) shall bring him unto the judges." Verse 29th, ואם שור נגח הוא מתמל שלשם והועד בבעליו "But if the ox were wont to push with his horn in time past, and it has been testified to his owners" (that is, to his owner)—*Isaiah* vi. 8, Hebrew, את מי אשלח ומי ילך לנו "To whom shall I send? and who will go for us?" (that is, for me.)

So also in the Qoran, نحن اقرب من حبل الوريد "We are (meaning I am) nearer than the jugular vein." انّا خلقناه بقدر "Surely we (meaning I) created every thing in proportion." In these two texts of the Qoran, God is represented to have spoken in the plural number, although Mohummud cannot be supposed to have employed a mode of expression, which he could have supposed capable of being considered favourable to the Trinity.

But what are we to think of such reasoning as that which finds a confirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity in the thrice repeated term "holy" in verse 3d, chapter 6th of *Isaiah ;* following this mode of argument the repetitions of the term " Eli, Eli," or, " My God, my God," by Jesus in his human nature in *Matthew* xxvii. 46, equally establishes the duality of the Godhead So also the holy name of the supreme Deity being composed of four letters in the Hebrew יהוה; in Greek Θεὸς; in Latin Deus ; in Arabic الله; and in Sunscrit ब्रह्म, clearly denotes the quadrality of the Godhead ! ! ! But these and all similar modes of argument that have been resorted to, are worthy of notice only as they serve to exhibit the extraordinary force of prejudice and superstition.

The most extraordinary circumstance is, that some should quote in support of the Trinity, the following sentence, " For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one," representing it as the 7th verse, chap. vth, of the first epistle of John. This is supposed to have been at first composed as a paraphrase upon what stands as verse 8th of the same chapter, (" and there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood ; and these three agree in one"), and met with approbation. It was however for a length of time known only in oral circulation ; but was afterwards placed in the

margin of some editions, and at last introduced into the text, most probably in the fifteenth century, as an original verse. From that time it has been the common practice to insert this verse amongst those which are collected in support of the Trinitarian doctrine. It may have served in this way to confirm and strengthen prejudice, though few biblical critics ever attached the smallest value to it either way. This interpretation is so modern and so obvious, that several Trinitarian Editors and Commentators of the Bible, such as Griesbach and Michaelis, (who never allowed their zeal for their sect to overcome the prudence and candour with which they were endowed,) have omitted to insert it in their late works on the New Testament; knowing perhaps that such an interpolation, so far from strengthening the doctrine they maintain, has excited great doubts as to the accuracy of other passages generally relied upon for its support.

We have already, I trust, seen distinctly that none of the lessons taught by Christ to his disciples teach us to believe in him as God; but as most Trinitarian authors assert that this doctrine was fully revealed by his Apostles speaking under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, it may be worth while to examine whether it be included by them amongst the doctrines of the Christian religion. This question may be immediately determined by referring to the history of the Acts of the Apostles; for if the doctrine of

the Trinity had been considered by them as an essential part of what they were commanded to teach, we should certainly find it insisted upon in the discourses they addressed to their converts. But we shall look in vain for any expression amongst those reported by Luke, that indicates the profession of such a belief by the Apostles themselves; far less that they exacted an acknowledgment of its truth, from those whom they admitted by the rite of Baptism into the faith of Christianity.

Acts ii. 22, "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know;" 32, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses." 36, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." iii. 22 and 23, "For Moses truly said unto the Fathers, a Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people." iv. 12, "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." 26 and 27, "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers

were gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, &c." v. 31, "Him has God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." vii. 56. 7, "And said, behold, I see the heavens open, and the Son of man standing on the right-hand of God." viii. 37 and 38, "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." x. 38, "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." 42, "And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he who was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead." ch. xiii. 38, "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." xvii. 3, "Opening and alledging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ."

Thus we find the Apostles never hesitated to hazard their lives by declaring before the Jews that their master was a Prophet, the expected Messiah, the Son of the living God; which was equally offensive to their countrymen, as if they had called him God himself; yet in none of the Sermons do we ever find them

representing him as the true God. In the same manner Jesus himself never assumed that character to himself, although he repeatedly avowed that he was the Messiah, the Son of God, whereby he knew that according to their law he would draw the penalty of death upon himself. As to the nature of those doctrines of Christianity deemed essential in the earliest times, I shall content myself with making a few extracts from the ecclesiastical History of Mosheim, a celebrated author among Trinitarians, which will prove that the doctrine of the Trinity, so zealously maintained as fundamental by the generality of modern Christians, made not its appearance as an essential, or even secondary article of Christian faith until the commencement of the fourth century ; and then it was introduced after long and violent discussions by the majority of an assembly, who were supported by the authority of a monarch. Mosheim, volume 1st, page 100, " Nor in this first century was the distinction made between Christians of a more or less perfect order which took place afterwards; whoever acknowledged Christ as the Saviour of mankind, and made solemn profession of his confidence in him, was immediately baptized and received into the Church." Page 411, " Soon after its commencement, even in the year 317, a new contention arose in Egypt upon a subject of much higher importance, and with consequences of a yet more pernicious nature ; the subject of this fatal controversy, which kindled such deplorable division throughout

the Christian world, was the doctrine of three persons of the Godhead; a doctrine which in the three preceding centuries had happily escaped the vain curiosity of human researches, and been left undefined and undetermined by any particular set of ideas. The Church indeed had frequently decided against the Sabellians and others, that there was a real difference between the Father and the Son, and that the Holy Ghost was distinct from them both; or as we commonly speak, that three distinct persons exist in the Deity; but the mutual relation of these persons to each other, and the nature of the distinction that subsists between them, are matters that hitherto were neither disputed nor explained, with respect to which the Church had consequently observed a profound silence:—nothing was declared to the faith of Christians in this matter, nor were there any modes of expression prescribed as requisite to be used in speaking of the mystery. Hence it happened, that the Christian doctors entertained different sentiments upon this subject without giving the least offence, and discoursed variously concerning the distinction between Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost, each one following his respective opinion with the utmost liberty." On this quotation I beg leave to remark, that if in the first and purest ages of Christianity the followers of Christ entertained such different opinions on the subject of the distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, without incurring the charge of heresy and heterodoxy, and without even break-

ing the tie of Christian affection towards each other, it is a melancholy contrast that the same freedom of opinion on this subject is not now allowed, nor the same mutual forbearance maintained amongst those who call themselves Christians. Mosheim, page 412, " In an assembly of Presbyters of Alexandria, the Bishop of that city, whose name was Alexander, expressed his sentiments on this head with a high degree of freedom and confidence; and maintained among other things, that the Son was not only of the same eminence and dignity, but also of the same essence with the Father: this assertion was opposed by Arius, one of the Presbyters, a man of a subtile turn, and remarkable for his eloquence." Page 414, " The emperor Constantine, looking upon the subject of this controversy as a matter of small importance, and as little connected with the fundamental and essential doctrines of religion, contented himself at first with addressing a letter to the contending parties, in which he admonished them to put an end to their disputes; but when the Prince saw that his admonitions were without effect, and that troubles and commotions which the passions of men too often mingle with religious disputes were spreading and encreasing daily throughout the empire, he assembled at length in the year 325, the famous Council of Nice in Bithynia, wherein the deputies of the Church Universal were summoned to put an end to this controversy. In this general Council, after many keen debates and violent

efforts of the two parties, the doctrine of Arius was condemned; Christ declared consubstantial or of the same essence with the Father; the vanquished Presbyter banished among the Illyrians, and his followers compelled to give their assent to the creed or confession of faith which was composed by this Council." It must not escape the notice of my readers, that so late as the year 314, the doctrine of the Son being of the same nature with the Father was supposed to be a matter of small importance, and little connected with the fundamental and essential doctrines of religion.

The reason for the majority being in favour of the three persons of the Godhead at the Council of Nice, may be easily accounted for, as I noticed before. More than nine-tenths of the Christians of that age, including the Emperor and Princes, were gentile converts, to whom the idea of a plurality of Gods was most familiar and acceptable, and to whose reason as well as practice the worship of a deity in the human shape was perfectly consonant, as appears from the following quotation, as well as from the Roman and Grecian histories. Mosheim, page 25, "The deities of almost all nations were either ancient heroes renowned for noble exploits and worthy deeds, or kings and generals who had founded empires, or women become illustrious by remarkable actions or useful inventions; the merit of these distinguished and eminent persons, contemplated by their poste-

rity with an enthusiastic gratitude, was the reason of their being exalted to celestial honours." We find also in the Acts of the Apostles, Paul declared to be God by the people of Melita, and both Paul and Barnabas regarded as gods by the inhabitants of Lystra; and the Saviour was ranked in the number of false gods even by professed heathens. *Acts* xxviii. 6, "Howbeit they looked when he (Paul) should have swollen or fallen down dead suddenly; but after they had looked a great while, and saw no harm come to him, they changed their minds, and said he was a God." *Acts* xiv. 11, "The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men." Mosheim, page 25, "Many who were not willing to adopt the whole of the doctrines of Christianity, were nevertheless, as appears from undoubted records, so struck with the account of his life and actions, and so charmed with the sublime purity of his Precepts, that they numbered him (Jesus) among the greatest heroes, nay, even among the gods themselves." Page 46, "So illustrious was the fame of Christ's power grown after his resurrection from the dead, and the miraculous gifts shed from on high upon his Apostles, that the emperor Tiberius is said to have proposed his being enrolled among the gods of Rome, which the opposition of the Senate hindered from taking effect." If some of the heathens from the nature of their superstitions could rank Jesus among their false gods, it is no wonder if others, when nominally converted to Christianity,

should have placed him on an equality with the true God, and should have passed a decree, constituting him one of the persons of the Godhead. These facts coincide entirely with my own firm persuasion of the impossibility, that a doctrine so inconsistent with the evidence of the senses as that of three persons in one being, should ever gain the sincere assent of any one, into whose mind it has not been instilled in early education. Early impressions alone can induce a Christian to believe that three are one, and one is three; just as by the same means a Hindoo is made to believe that millions are one, and one is millions; and to imagine that an inanimate idol is a living substance, and capable of assuming various forms. As I have sought to attain the truths of Christianity from the words of the author of this religion, and from the undisputed instructions of his holy Apostles, and not from a parent or tutor, I cannot help refusing my assent to any doctrine which I do not find scriptural.

Before concluding, I beg to revert to one or two arguments respecting the nature of Jesus Christ, which have been already partly touched upon. It is maintained that his nature was double, being divine as Son of God, and human as Son of man—that in the former capacity he performed miracles and exercised authority over the wind and the sea, and as man was subject to and experienced human feelings, joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain. Is it possible to consider a being in the human shape,

acting daily in a manner required by the nature of the human race, as the invisible God, above mortality and all the feelings of mortal beings, from a mere figurative application of the terms "Son of God" or "God" to him, and from the circumstance of his performing wonderful works contrary to the usual course of nature? If so, what can prevent one from esteeming Moses and others, as possessed of both divine and human nature, since Moses likewise is called God distinctly, (*Exodus* vii. 1, "I have made thee a God to Pharaoh,") and he is also called man, ("wherewith Moses, the man of God, blessed Israel," *Deut.* xxxiii. 1.); and consequently it may be alleged, that in his divine capacity Moses performed miracles, and commanded the heavens and the earth, ("Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak; and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth;" *Deut.* xxxii. 1. "For it (the word of Moses) is not a vain thing for you, because *it is your life*," 47,) and that in his human capacity he suffered death and other miseries. Neither Jesus nor Moses ever declared, "I say so, and perform this as God; and I say so, and perform that as man." If we give so great a latitude to the modes of reasoning employed to justify the idea of one being possessed of two sorts of consciousness, as God and man; two sorts of minds, divine and human; and two sets of souls, eternal and perishable; then we shall not only be at a loss to know what is rational and what is absurd, but shall find our senses and experience of little or no use to us. The mode of interpreting the scriptures which

is universally adopted, is this, that when two terms seemingly contradictory are applied to one person, then that which is most consistent with reason and with the context should be taken in a literal, and the other in a figurative sense. Thus God is declared to be immaterial, and yet to have hands, eyes, &c. The latter expressions taken literally being inconsistent with reason, and with other passages of the scriptures, are understood as metaphorically implying his power and knowledge, while the former is interpreted in its strict and literal sense: in like manner the term "Lord God," &c. applied to any other than the Supreme Being, must be figuratively understood. Were any one, in defiance of this general mode of interpretation, to insist that the term "God," applied to Jesus should be taken in its literal sense, and that consequently Jesus should be actually considered God in the human shape, he would not only acknowledge the same intimate connection of matter with God, that exists between matter and the human soul, but also would necessarily justify the application of such phrases as "Mother of God" to the virgin Mary, and "Brother of God" to James and others, which are highly derogatory to the character of the supreme author of the universe; and it is the use of phrases similar to these which has rendered the religion of the Hindoos so grossly absurd and contemptible. To admit that all things, whether possible or impossible to our understanding, are possible for God, is certainly favourable to the idea of a

mixed nature of God and man ; but at the same time would be highly detrimental both to religion and society: for all sorts of positions and tales, however impossible they may be, might in that case be advanced and supported on the same plea.

I now conclude my reply with noticing in a brief manner the modes of illustration that Trinitarians adopt both in conversation and in writing in support of the unity of the Godhead, in consistency with the distinction of three persons. 1st, That as the soul, will, and perception, though they are three things, yet are in fact one, so God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, though distinct persons, are to be esteemed as one. Admitting for a moment the propriety of this analogy, it serves to destroy totally their position, as to the three existences of the Godhead being distinct substances; for according to the established system of Theology the soul is believed to be the substance, and will and perceptions its properties, which have no distinct existence; in the same manner as weight and locality are the properties of matter, without having existence as separate substances. If this analogy then were to hold good, the Father would be acknowledged as a separate existence like the soul, but the Son and the Holy Spirit must be considered his attributes, as will and perception are of the soul:—a doctrine which resembles that of the heretic Sabellius and the early Egyptian Christians.

It is therefore necessary, that in endeavouring to prove the reasonableness of the idea respecting the unity of three distinct substances of the Godhead, from comparison between them, and the soul and its will and perception, they should establish first that the soul, will, and perception are three substances, and that they are at the same time one; and then should draw such an analogy, shewing the possibility of the position which they assume.

2ndly, That as notwithstanding the distinct existence of the sun, his rays of light and his rays of heat, they are considered as one; so God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, though separate substances, are one. Were we to admit the separate existence of heat, a point still disputed amongst philosophers, it would serve as an analogy so far as these three distinct substances, though different in nature, are connected together; but by no means would answer the purpose of illustrating their position, that these distinct persons are one in nature and essence: for the sun is acknowledged to be a compact body; rays of light are fluid substances subject to absorption, and frequently found emanating from other bodies as well as the sun; and heat, an existence of which the most remarkable property is its power of expanding other substances, is frequently unaccompanied by the rays of the sun. But it is universally acknowledged, that whatever argument tends to prove a distinction be-

tween substances, must necessarily overturn their unity in essence and existence; and therefore the unity in nature and essence which they assert to exist in the three persons of the Godhead not being found in the sun, light and heat, the analogy attempted to be drawn must be abandoned. Again, it is advanced, that as a single substance possesses various qualities, and consequently is viewed differently; so the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are in fact one God; yet the Deity in his capacity of Creator of the World is called the Father, and in his capacity of Mediator is termed the Son, in which he is generally supposed inferior to the Father; and in his office of sanctification is named the Holy Ghost, in which he is deemed inferior to both. I know not whether to consider such an argument as reasoning, or as a mockery of reason; since it justifies us in believing, that one and the same being in one of his capacities is superior to himself, and again in reference to another quality is inferior to himself; that he is in one case his own beloved Son, and then in another capacity is at the disposal of himself according to the entreaty of his Son. This mode of arguing after all serves to deny the Trinity, which represents the Godhead as consisting of three distinct persons, and not as one person possessing different attributes, which it is the object of Trinitarians to prove. They allege the united state of the soul and the body as analogous to the union of the Father and Son: but no one who believes in the separate existence of the soul, can for a moment suppose it to

be of the same essence as the body; so that unless they admit the immateriality of the Father alone, and assert the materiality of the Son in his pre-existent state, this illustration also must be set aside.

Some allege, that as the Son of Man designates human nature, so the Son of God expresses the nature of God. Were we to admit the term "God" as a common noun, and not a proper name, and Godhead as a genus like mankind, &c. and that Jesus was actually begotten of the Deity, this mode of reasoning would stand good; but Godhead must in this case be brought to a level with other genera, capable of performing animal functions, &c.

Some represent God as a compound substance, consisting of three parts, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, a representation in support of which they can offer no scriptural authority.—I would however wish to know, whether these parts (Father, Son, and Spirit) are of the same nature and existence, or each possessed of a different nature or essence. In the former case, there would be a total impossibility of composition; for composition absolutely requires articles or parts of different identity and essence; nothing being capable of composition with itself. Besides, the idea of such a compound substance is inconsistent with that distinct personality of Father, Son, and Spirit, which they maintain.—In the latter case (that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spi-

rit, being of different natures,) a composition of these three parts is not impossible; but it destroys the opinion which they entertain respecting the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, being of the same nature and essence, and of course implies, that the Godhead is liable to divisibility.

The argument so adduced by them would include in reality a denial of the epithet God to each part of the Godhead; for no portion of an existence, either ideal or perceptible in a true sense, can be called the existence itself; as it is one of the first axioms of abstract truth, that a part is less than the whole: but we find in the Scriptures the Father constantly called God in the strict and full signification of the term.—*John* xvii. 3, "This is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." 1 *Cor.* xv. 24, "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." 1 *Cor.* viii. 6, "To us there is but one God, the Father." *Ephesians* iv. 5, 6, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

Another argument which has great weight with that sect is, that unless Jesus is God and man, he cannot be considered as qualified to perform the office of mediator between God and man; because it is only by this compound character that he inter-

cedes for guilty creatures with their offended God.—This mode of reasoning is most evidently opposed to common sense, as well as to the Scriptures; though their zeal in support of the Trinity has not permitted them to see it. I say, opposed to common sense; because we observe, that when any one feels angry with and inclined to punish one of a herd of cattle which may have trespassed on his grounds, or when a rider wishes to chastise his horse on account of its viciousness, it is his friend or neighbour generally who intercedes in its behalf, and is successful in procuring mercy to the offending animal, in his simple nature, without assuming in addition that of the creature in whose behalf he intercedes—I say, opposed to scripture; because we find in the sacred writings, that Abraham, Moses, and other Prophets stood mediators and interceded successfully in behalf of an offending people with their offended God; but none of them possessed the double nature of God and man. —*Numb.* xi. 1, 2, "When the people complained it displeased the Lord; and the Lord heard it, and his anger was kindled, and the fire of the Lord burnt among them, and consumed them that were in the uttermost parts of the camp. And the people cried unto Moses; and when Moses prayed unto the Lord, the fire was quenched."—xiv 19, 20, Moses prayed to the Lord, "Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people, according unto the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people, from Egypt even until now. And the Lord said, I have

pardoned them according to thy word."—xxi. 7, "Therefore the people came to Moses, and said, We have sinned, for we have spoken against the Lord, and against thee: pray unto the Lord that he take away the serpents from us: and Moses prayed for the people." xxxii. 30. "And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin, and now I will go up unto the Lord, peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sins."—*Gen.* xviii. 32, "And he (Abraham) said, O let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak yet but this once—Peradventure ten shall be found there. And he said, I will not destroy it for ten's sake." I find several others performing the office of mediator and intercessor in common with Jesus, as I noticed before; and indeed this seems to have been an office common to all Prophets: but none of them is supposed to have been clothed with Godhead and manhood in union.—*Jeremiah* xxvii. 18, "But if they be Prophets, and if the word of the Lord be with them, let them now make intercession to the Lord of Hosts, &c." *Deuteronomy* v. 5, "I (Moses) stood between the Lord and you at that time, to shew you the word of the Lord." I regret very much that a sect generally so enlightened should on the one hand have supposed the divine and human natures to be so diametrically opposed to each other, that it is morally impossible for God even to accept intercession from a mere human being in behalf of the human race, and on the other hand should have advanced

that the Deity joined to his own nature that of man, and was made flesh, possessing all the members and exercising all the functions of man—propositions which are morally inconsistent with each other.

To avoid the supposed dishonor attached to the appointment of a mediator less than divine, the Deity is declared by them to have assumed the human shape, and to have subjected himself to the feelings and inclinations natural to the human species; which is not only inconsistent with the immutable nature of God, but highly derogatory to the honor and glory which we are taught to ascribe to him.

Other arguments of the same nature are frequently advanced, but they are all together much fewer in number and far less convincing than those which are commonly brought forward by Hindoos to support their polytheism. Since then in evincing the truth and excellence of the Precepts of Jesus, there is no need of the aid of metaphysical arguments, and since as a last resource they do not depend for their support on the ground of mystery, the Compiler has in the discharge of his duty towards his Countrymen properly introduced them as a Guide to Peace and Happiness.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

On the Quotations from the Old Testament contained in the New.

It cannot have escaped the notice of attentive readers of the Scriptures, that the bare quotations in the New Testament from the Old, when unaccompanied with their respective contexts, are liable to be misunderstood. Those who are not well versed in the sacred writings, finding in those references such phrases as apparently corroborate their already acquired opinions, not only lay stress upon them, in support of the sentiments generally adopted, but even lead others very often, though unintentionally, into great errors.

Thus *Matthew* ii. 15. "Out of Egypt have I called my Son." The Evangelist refers to verse 1st chapter xi. of *Hosea;* which, though really applied to Israel, represented there as the Son of God, is used by the Apostle in reference to the Saviour, in consideration of a near resemblance between their circumstances in this instance:—both Israel and Jesus were carried into Egypt and recalled from thence, and both were denominated in the Scriptures the "Son of God." The passage of *Hosea* thus runs from chapter xi. verse 1st to the 3rd, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt. As they called them, so they went from them:

they sacrificed unto Baalim, and burnt incense to graven images. I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms; but they knew not that I healed them." In which Israel, who is represented as a child of God, is declared to have sacrificed to Baalim, and to have burnt incense to graven images—circumstances which cannot justly be ascribed to the Saviour.

With a view therefore to remove the possibility of such errors, and to convince my readers that all the references in the New Testament with their contexts manifest the unity of God and natural inferiority of the Messiah to the Father of the universe, I have endeavoured to arrange them methodically, beginning with such quotations as were made by Jesus himself, agreeably to the proposal of the Reverend Editor.

Quotations by Jesus himself exactly agreeing with the Hebrew.

Matthew iv. 4, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God;" the same in *Luke* iv. 4, compared with *Deuteronomy* viii. 3, "And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know, that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live."

Matthew iv. 7, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God;"—compared with *Deuteronomy* vi. 16, 17, "Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted him in Massah. Ye shall diligently keep the commandments of

the Lord your God, and his testimonies, and his statutes, which he hath commanded thee."

Matthew ix. 13, "But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice"—compared with *Hosea* vi. 5, 6, "Therefore have I hewed them by the Prophets; I have slain them by the words of my mouth: and thy judgments are as the light that goeth forth. For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings."

Matthew xix. 19. xxii. 39, "Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"—compared with *Exodus* xx. 12, "Honour thy father and mother, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee"—and *Leviticus* xix. 18, "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the Lord."

Matthew xxi. 42, "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the *Lord's doing*, and it is marvellous in our eyes;"—the same in *Mark* xii. 10, *Luke* xx. 17, compared with *Psalms* cxviii. 22, 23, "I (says David) will praise thee; for thou hast heard me, and art become my salvation. The stone which the builders refused is become the head-stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes." To decide whether this passage is principally applied to David, and in the way of accommodation to Jesus, or originally to Jesus himself, is entirely left to the discretion of my readers; but it is evident in either case, that it is God that has *raised* the *stone so rejected.*

Matthew xxii. 44, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool"—the same in *Mark* xii. 36, *Luke* xx. 42, compared with *Psalms* cx. 1, 2, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies." This passage is simply applied to the Messiah, manifesting that the victory gained by him over his enemies was entirely owing to the influence of God.

John x. 35, "Ye are gods"—compared with *Psalm* lxxxii. 1, 6, 7, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; he judgeth among the gods. I have said, Ye are gods, and all of you are children of the most High: but ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes"—wherein Jesus shews from this quotation, that the term God is figuratively applicable in the Scriptures to creatures of a superior nature.

Quotations made by Jesus himself, nearly agreeing with the Hebrew.

Matthew iv. 10, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only thou shalt serve"—compared with *Deuteronomy* vi. 13, "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name."

Matthew xiii. 14, "By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive"—compared with *Isaiah* vi. 9, and its context, "I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I (Isaiah), Here am I, send me. And he said, Go and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed,

but perceive not." This censure has original reference to the conduct of the people to whom Isaiah was sent, but it is applied by Jesus in an accommodated sense to that of the Jews of his time.

Matthew xix. 5, "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh"—compared with *Genesis* ii. 23, "And Adam said; This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman; because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh."

Matthew xix. 18, 19, "Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"—compared with *Exodus* xx. 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, "Honour thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour."

Matthew xxii. 32, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob"—compared with *Exodus* iii. 6, "Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God."

Matthew xxii. 37, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;" the same in *Mark* xii. 30, *Luke* x. 27, compared with *Deuteronomy* vi. 5, "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God

with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might."

Matthew xxvi. 31, "Then saith Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad"—compared with *Zechariah* xiii. 7, "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow*, saith the Lord of hosts: smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones."

Verse 7, either was originally applied to Agrippa, (אגריפס), the last king of the Jews, whose subjects were scattered after he had been smitten with the sword, and in an accommodated sense is applied by Jesus to himself, whose disciples were in like manner dispersed, while he was suffering afflictions from his enemies—or is directly applicable to Jesus; but in both cases his total subordination and submission to the Father of the universe is too obvious to be disputed.

John vi. 45, "It is written in the Prophets, And they shall be all taught of God.—Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me"—compared with *Isaiah* liv. 13, "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children."

John xiii. 18, "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me"—

---

* The word עמית found in the original Hebrew Scripture, signifies one that lives near another; therefore the word "fellow" in the English translation is not altogether correct, as justly observed by Archbishop Newcome.

compared with *Psalm* xli. 9, " Mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me," is immediately applicable to David and his friend Ahithophel, who betrayed him ; and secondarily, to Jesus, and Judas, his traitorous apostle.

John xv. 25, " But this cometh to pass, that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause,"—compared with *Psalm* cix. 2, 3, " They have spoken against me with a lying tongue. They compassed me about also with words of hatred; and fought against me without a cause." Verse 3d was originally applied to David and his enemies, and in an accommodated sense to Jesus and the Jews of his day.

Quotation made by Jesus himself, agreeing with the Hebrew in sense, but not in words.

Matthew xxi. 16, " Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise"—compared with *Psalms* viii. 2, and its preceding verse, " Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast ordained strength, because of thine enemies ; that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger."

Quotation taken from combined passages of Scripture.

Matthew xxi. 13, " And said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer ; but you have made it a den of thieves"—compared with *Isaiah* lvi. 17, " For mine house shall be called the house of prayer for all people." vii. 11, " Is this house which is called by my name become a den of robbers in your eyes ?"

Quotation differing from the Hebrew, but agreeing with the Septuagint.

Matthew xv. 7, 8, and 9, "Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men"—compared with *Isaiah* xxix. 13, which in the Septuagint corresponds exactly with the Gospel, but which in verse 9. differs from the original Hebrew, thus translated in the common version—"And their fear toward me is taught by the precepts of men."

Quotations in which there is reason to suspect a different reading in Hebrew, or that the Apostles understood the words in a sense different from that expressed in our lexicons.

Matthew xi. 10, "This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger *before thy face*, who shall prepare thy way before *thee*"—compared with *Malachi* iii. 1, "Behold I *will* send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before *me*." *Matthew* xxvi. 31, "I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad"—compared with *Zechariah* vii. 8, "Smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered."

Luke iv. 8, "Thou shalt *worship* the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve"—compared with *Deuteronomy* vi. 13, "Thou shalt *fear* the Lord thy God, and serve him."

Quotations slightly varying from the Septuagint.

Luke iv. 18, 19, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the

poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and *recovering of sight to the blind;* to set at liberty them that are bruised; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord"—compared with *Isaiah* lxi. 1, 2, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek: he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

Now I beg the attention of my readers to these quotations ascribed to Jesus himself, and appeal to them, whether he assumed in any of these references the character of the Deity, or even equality with him. I am certain that they will find nothing of the kind; Jesus declared himself in these instances entirely subordinate to the Almighty God, and subject to his authority, and frequently compared himself to David or some of the other Prophets.

No. II.

On the references made to the Old Testament in support of the Deity of Jesus.

TRINITARIAN Divines quote *John* i. 14, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth," as a reference to *Isaiah* ix. 6, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace,"—though the evangelist John *made no allusion* to this passage of *Isaiah* in the verse in question. The passage of *Isaiah* thus referred to was applied to *Hezekiah*, the son of Ahaz, figuratively designated as the son of the virgin, the daughter of Zion, to wit Jerusalem, foretold by the Prophet as the deliverer of the city from the hands of its enemies, though its utter detruction was then threatened by the kings of Syria and Israel. The words "a virgin" according to the English translation are "the virgin" both in the original Hebrew and in the Greek of the Gospel of *Matthew*, as well as in the Septuagint. But unless Ahaz was aware of the allusion of the Prophet, the use of the definite article in this passage must be quite inexplicable; and no one will contend for a moment, that it was given to that wicked king to understand that the mother of Christ was the virgin alluded to; what then could Ahaz have comprehended by the expression "the virgin?" On referring to 2*d Kings* xix. 21, we

find the same Prophet make use of the very expression, where he informs the king *Hezekiah* of the denunciation of God against Sennacherib, the blasphemous king of Assyria, who was at that time besieging Jesusalem. "This is the word that the Lord hath spoken concerning him; *The virgin*, the daughter of Zion, hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn."—It is impossible to conceive that these words, expressly spoken of the king of Assyria, bear any allusion to the virgin, the mother of Christ; and it illustrates clearly the otherwise obscure expression of the Prophet addressed to Ahaz, when he foretold to him the happy reign of his successor Hezekiah. In *Isaiah* x. 32, "He (the king of Assyria) shall shake his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem." The epithet "The daughter of Zion," which in the last passage was used as synonimous with "the virgin," here signifies Jerusalem itself, in which sense it was commonly used in the figurative language of the Prophet, and no doubt well understood by Ahaz; for we find the same words in many other passages used to signify either a city or the people of a city. *Isaiah* xxiii. 12, "And he said, Thou shalt no more rejoice, O thou oppressed *virgin*, daughter of Zion." Chapter xlvii. 1, "Come down, and sit in the dust, O *virgin* daughter of Babylon."—*Jeremiah* xiv. 17, "Therefore thou shalt say this word unto them: Let mine eyes run down with tears night and day, and let them not cease; for the *virgin* daughter of my people is broken with a great breach."—xviii. 13, "Therefore thus saith the Lord; Ask ye now among the heathen, who hath heard such things: the *virgin* of Israel hath done a very horri-

ble thing."—xxxi. 4, "Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O *virgin* of Israel: thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry."—13, "Then shall the *virgin* rejoice in the dance, &c."—21, "Set thee up waymarks, make thee high heaps: set thine heart toward the high way, even the way which thou wentest: turn again, O *virgin* of Israel, turn again to these thy cities."—*Lam.* i. 15, "The Lord hath trodden the *virgin*, the daughter of Judah, as in a wine-press."—ii. 13, "What thing shall I take to witness for thee? what thing shall I liken to thee, O daughter of Jerusalem? what thing shall I liken to thee, O *virgin* daughter of Zion? for thy breach is great like the sea; who can heal thee?"—*Amos* v. 2, "The *virgin* of Israel is fallen, she shall no more rise: she is forsaken upon her land; there is none to raise her up."

To shew that the passages in question, as well as all that is foretold in this and the succeeding chapters, refer to the reign of Hezekiah, nothing more than a comparison of them with the records of that reign is requisite.—I shall therefore lay before my readers, all those verses in these chapters that are commonly referred to by Trinitarians as alluding to the coming of Christ, with their contexts, together with such parts of the history of the reign of Hezekiah as appear to me to be clearly indicated by those passages.

Isaiah vii. 1, "And it came to pass in the days of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, king of Judah, that Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, went up toward Jerusalem to war against it, but could not prevail against it. 2 And it was told the house of David, saying, Syria is confederate with

Ephraim. And his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind. 3 Then said the Lord unto Isaiah, Go forth now to meet Ahaz, thou, and Shearjashub thy son, at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field; 4 And say unto him, Take heed, and be quiet; fear not, neither be fainthearted, for the two tails of these smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin with Syria, and of the son of Remaliah. 5 Because Syria, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah, have taken evil counsel against thee, saying, 6 Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set a king in the midst of it, *even* the son of Tabeal: 7 Thus saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass. 8 For the head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus *is* Rezin; and within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people. 9 And the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son. If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established. 10 Moreover, the Lord spake again unto Ahaz, saying, 11 Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above. 12 But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord. 13 And he said, Hear ye now, O house of David, Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? 14 Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, the virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. 15 Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. 16 For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. 17 The Lord shall bring upon thee, and

upon thy people, and upon thy father's house, days that have not come, from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah; even the king of Assyria."

Chapter viii. 5, "The Lord spake also unto me again; saying, 6 Forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah that go softly, and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son; 7 Now therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory: and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks: 8 And he shall pass through Judah; he shall overflow and go over,—he shall reach even to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel."

Chapter ix. 1, "Nevertheless, the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations. 2 The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. 3 Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy: they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil. 4 For thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, and the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor, as in the day of Midian. 5 For every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood; but this shall be with burning and fuel of fire. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Coun-

sellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. 7 Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end* upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

Chapter x. 5. "O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. 6 I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets. 7 Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so, but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few. 8 For he saith, Are not my princes altogether kings? 9 Is not Calno as Carchemish? is not Hamath as Arpad? is not Samaria as Damascus? † 10 As my hand hath found the kingdoms of the idols, and whose graven images did excel them of Jerusalem and of Samaria; 11 Shall I not, as I have done unto Samaria and her idols, so do to Jerusalem and her idols? 12 Wherefore it shall come to pass, that, when the Lord hath performed his whole work upon mount Zion and on Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks."—16 "Therefore shall

* Those that are at all versed in scriptural language will attach no weight to the terms "no end" and "for ever" found in v. 7; for the former often signifies plenteousness, and the latter long but not eternal duration. Vide Eccl. iv. 16, "There is no end of all the people, even of all that have been before them." Isaiah ii. 7, "Neither is there any end of their treasure, neither is there any end of their chariot." Nahum ii. 9, "There is none end of their store." 33, "And there is none end of their corpses." Ps. cxlv. 2, 9, "I will praise thy name for *ever and ever*." Deut. xv. 17, "And he shall be thy servant *for ever*."

† Compare ver. 9, 10, 11, with the historical relation of the vain boastings of the Assyrian narrated in 2 Kings, chap. xviii. ver. 33, 34, 35.

the Lord, the Lord of hosts, send among his fat ones leanness; and under his glory he shall kindle a burning like the burning of a fire. 17 And the light of Israel shall be for a fire, and his *Holy One* for a flame: and it shall burn and devour his thorns and briers in one day."—"24 Therefore thus saith the Lord God of hosts, O my people that dwellest in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrian: he shall smite thee with a rod, and shall lift up his staff against thee, after the manner of Egypt. 25 For yet a very little while, and the indignation shall cease, and mine anger, in their destruction." 27 * "And it shall come to pass in that day, that his burden shall be taken away from off thy shoulder, and his yoke from off thy neck, and the yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing."

2d Kings xviii. 1, "Now it came to pass, in the third year of Hoshea son of Elah king of Israel, that Hezekiah the son of Ahaz king of Judah began to reign. 2 Twenty and five years old was he when he began to reign; and he reigned twenty and nine years in Jerusalem: his mother's name also was Abi, the daughter of Zachariah. 3 And he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all that David his father did. 4 He removed the high places, and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brasen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehushtan. 5 He trusted in the Lord God of Israel; so that *after him* was none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were *before him*. 6 For he clave to the Lord, and departed not from following him, but kept his commandments, which the Lord commanded Moses. 7 And the Lord was

* Compare with 2d Kings ch. xvi. 7, "So Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath-Pileser King of Assyria, saying, I am thy servant and thy son, &c." and ch. xviii. 7, as above.

with him : and he prospered whithersoever he went forth : and he rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not. 8 He smote the Philistines, even unto Gaza, and the borders thereof, from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city."—17 " And the king of Assyria sent Tartan, and Rabsaris, and Rab-shakeh, from Lachish to king Hezekiah, with a great host against Jerusalem. And they went up and came to Jerusalem. And when they were come up, they came and stood by the conduit of the upper pool, which is in the highway of the fuller's field."—28 " Then Rab-shakeh stood, and cried with a loud voice in the Jews' language, and spake, saying, Hear the word of the great king, the king of Assyria: 29 Thus saith the king, Let not Hezekiah deceive you: for he shall not be able to deliver you out of his hand : 30 Neither let Hezekiah make you trust in the Lord, saying, The Lord will surely deliver us, and this city shall not be delivered into the hand of the king of Assyria. 31 Hearken not unto Hezekiah : for thus saith the king of Assyria, Make an agreement with me by a present, and come out to me, and then eat ye every man of his own vine, and every one of his fig-tree, and drink ye every one the waters of his cistern : 32 Until I come and take you away to a land like your own land ; a land of corn and wine, a land of bread and vineyards, a land of oil-olive and of honey, that ye may live, and not die ; and hearken not unto Hezekiah, when he persuadeth you, saying, The Lord will deliver us. 33 Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered at all his land out of the hand of the king of Assyria ? 34 Where are the gods of Hamath, and of Arpad ? where are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah ? have they delivered Samaria out of mine hand ? 35 Who are they among all the gods of the countries that have delivered their country out of mine hand, that the Lord should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand ?"

Chap. xix. 15, " And Hezekiah prayed before the Lord, and said, O Lord God of Israel, which dwellest between the cherubims, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth ; thou hast made heaven and earth. 16 Lord, bow down thine ear, and hear : open, Lord, thine eyes, and see : and hear the words of Sennacherib, which hath sent him to reproach the living God. 19 Now therefore, O Lord our God, I beseech thee save thou us out of his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou art the Lord God, even thou only. 20 Then Isaiah the son of Amoz sent to Hezekiah, saying, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, That which thou hast prayed to me against Sennacherib king of Assyria I have heard. 21 This is the word that the Lord hath spoken concerning him ; *The virgin, the daughter of Zion*, hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn ; the daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee. 22 Whom hast thou reproached and blasphemed ? and against whom hast thou exalted thy voice, and lifted up thine eyes on high ? even against the Holy One of Israel. 23 By thy messengers thou hast reproached the Lord, and hast said, With the multitude of my chariots I am come up to the height of the mountains, to the sides of Lebanon, and will cut down the tall cedar trees thereof, and the choice fir trees thereof: and I will enter into the lodgings of his borders, and into the forest of his Carmel."—27 " But I know thy abode, and thy going out, and thy coming in, and thy rage against me. 28 Because thy rage against me and thy tumult is come up into mine ears, therefore I will put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest." 32 " Therefore thus saith the Lord concerning the king of Assyria, He shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with shield, nor cast a bank

against it. 33 By the way that he came, by the same shall he return, and shall not come into this city, saith the Lord. 34 For I will defend this city, to save it, for mine own sake, and for my servant David's sake. 35 And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses. 36 So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh. 37 And it came to pass, as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, that Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons smote him with the sword; and they escaped into the land of Armenia: and Esar-haddon his son reigned in his stead."

2d *Chron.* xxx. 24, "For Hezekiah king of Judah did give to the congregation a thousand bullocks, and seven thousand sheep; and the princes gave to the congregation a thousand bullocks, and ten thousand sheep: and a great number of priests sanctified themselves. 25 And all the congregation of Judah, with the priests and the Levites, and all the congregation that came out of Israel, and the strangers that came out of the land of Israel, and that dwelt in Judah, rejoiced. 26 So there was great joy in Jerusalem; for since the time of Solomon, the son of David king of Israel, there was not the like in Jerusalem. 27 Then the priests the Levites arose and blessed the people: and their voice was heard, and their prayer came up to his holy dwelling-place, even unto heaven."

Chap. xxxi. 20, "And thus did Hezekiah throughout all Judah, and wrought that which was good and right and truth before the Lord his God. 21 And in every work that he began in the service of the house of God, and in the

law, and in the commandments, to seek his God, he did it with all his heart, and prospered."

Chap. xxxii. 23, "And many brought gifts unto the Lord to Jerusalem, and presents to Hezekiah king of Judah: so that he was magnified in the sight of all nations from thenceforth. 33 And Hezekiah slept with his fathers, and they buried him in the chiefest of the sepulchres of the sons of David: and all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem did him honour at his death. And Manasseh his son reigned in his stead."

If, as is declared by Trinitarians, the child promised in chap. vii. 14, be the same that is alluded to in ix. 6, and x. 17, it is quite evident from the context, that he was to be the deliverer of the Jews from the hands of the king of Assyria, and was to be distinguished by the excellence of his administration and the respect in which he was to be held by all nations. Making allowance for the hyperbolical style of Eastern nations, nothing can more aptly apply as prophecy than these passages do to the reign of Hezekiah, as described in the above extracts from *Kings* and *Chronicles*. But what, it may be asked, had the birth of Christ to do with the destruction of the king of Assyria? or how could it be said that before he "knew to refuse the evil and choose the good," the land of Syria and of Israel should be deserted of their respective kings Rezin and Pekah, who were gathered to their fathers many years before his birth?

This illustrious son of Ahaz was not the only king among the select nation of God, that was honoured with such names as Hezekiah or "God my strength," and "Emmanuel" or "God with us;" and also with such epithets as "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace." We find several other

chiefs of that tribe that used to walk in the way of God, dignified in Scripture with epithets of a similar import. *Genesis* xxxii. 28, "And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel (Prince of God): for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed." *Psalm* lxxxix. 18, "For the Lord is our defence; and THE HOLY ONE of Israel is our king. 19 Then thou spakest in vision to *thy Holy One*, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is *mighty:* I have exalted one chosen out of the people. 20 I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I *anointed* him: 27 Also I will make him MY FIRSTBORN, higher than the kings of the *earth*."

As to the word "a virgin" found in the English translation, I request my readers to advert to the original Hebrew העלמה "the virgin," as well as to the Greek both of the Septuagint and the Gospel of *Matthew*, ἡ παρθένος "the virgin," leaving it to them to judge, whether a translation which so entirely perverts the meaning preserved thoughout, by men whom we cannot suspect of ignorance of the original language, must not have proceeded from a previous determination to apply the term "virgin" as found in the Prophet to the mother of Christ, in order that the high titles applied to Hezekiah might in the most unqualified manner be understood of Jesus.

The Evangelist Matthew referred in his Gospel to ch. vii. 14. of *Isaiah*, merely for the purpose of accommodation; the Son of Ahaz and the Saviour resembling each other, in each being the means at different periods, though in different senses, of establishing the throne of the house of David. In the same manner he referred to *Hosea* xi. 1, in ii. 15. of his Gospel, and in many other instances. How inconsistent

is it that a sect, which maintains the omniscience and omnipotence of Jesus, should apply to him a passage, by which he is made subject to such a degree of ignorance, as not to be able at one period to distinguish between good and evil. (*Isaiah* vii. 16, " For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, &c.") Admitting that these quotations in *Isaiah* were originally applicable to Jesus, they cannot assist in proving the Deity of the Messiah; just as they fall short of proving the divinity of Hezekiah when applied to him:—for we find in the sacred writings the name of God, and even the term of Jehovah, the peculiar name of God, applied as an appellation to others, without establishing any argument for asserting the Deity of those to whom such names are given. *Jeremiah* xxxiii. 16, " In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." In the English version, the word Jehovah is rendered " Lord," in this and in other passages.—*Exodus* xvii. 15, " And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-nissi, or 'JEHOVAH MY BANNER.'" It is fortunate that some sect has not hitherto arisen, maintaining the Deity of Jerusalem, or of the altar of Moses, from the authority of the passages just mentioned.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, i. 8, 9, reference is made to *Psalm* xlv. 6, 7, " Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee, &c." I have frequently noticed that the term " God" in an inferior sense is often applied in the scriptures to the Messiah and other distinguished persons; but it deserves particularly to be noticed in this instance, that

the Messiah, in whatever sense he is declared God, is in the very same sense described in v. 6. ("God thy God") as *having a God superior to him*, and by whom he *was appointed* to the office of Messiah.

Supposed application of the term "Jehovah" to Jesus in references made to the Old Testament.

Luke i. 16, 17, "And many of the children of Israel shall he (John the Baptist) turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord"—compared with *Isaiah* xl. 3, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of Jehovah, make straight in the desert a highway for our God"—and also in *Malachi* iii. 1, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith Jehovah of hosts." From this, it is concluded by Trinitarians, that because the Prophet John is described as the forerunner of Jehovah, and in the evangelist as the forerunner of Jesus, therefore Jesus must be Jehovah.

In reply to this, it may be simply observed, that we find in the Prophet distinct and separate mention of Jehovah and of the Messiah as the messenger of the covenant; John therefore ought to be considered as the forerunner of both, in the same manner as a commander sent in advance to occupy a strong post in the country of the enemy, may be said to be preparing the way for the battles of his king,

or of the general whom the king places at the head of his army.

They also refer to *Isaiah* vi. 5, " For mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts"—comparing it with *John* xii. 41, " These things said Isaiah, when he saw his glory, and spake of him." The passage in the evangelist is more correctly explained by referring to *John* viii. 56, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day"—which cannot be understood of ocular vision, but prophetic anticipation ; whereas the glory seen in the vision of Isaiah was that of God himself in the delivery of the commands given to the Prophet on that occasion.

Corinthians i. 30, " But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, &c." is compared with *Jeremiah* xxiii. 6, " He shall be called Jehovah our righteousness." In reply to which I only refer my reader again to the passage in *Jeremiah* xxxiii. 16, in which Jerusalem also is called "Jehovah our righteousness," and to the phrase " *is made unto us of God*" found in the passage in question, and expressing the inferiority of Jesus to God. Also 2*d Cor.* v. 21, " That we might be made the righteousness of God in him," where St. Paul says, that all Christians may be made the righteousness of God.

Mr. Brown, a celebrated Trinitarian Commentator, retains the common version of *Jeremiah* xxiii. 6, and applies it to Jesus, whom he supposes to be " Jehovah our righteousness." But in xxxiii. 16, where the construction in the original Hebrew is precisely the same, he alters the version, and thus renders it in the margin, " he who shall call her is Jehovah our righteousness ;" instead of applying the phrase " Jehovah our righteousness" to Jerusalem, in

the same manner as he had applied it to Jesus in the former passage.—I therefore deem it necessary to give the original Hebrew of both texts, and a verbal translation of them.—The reader will judge how strongly the judgment of the learned Commentator was biassed in support of a favourite doctrine. *Jeremiah* xxiii. 6, בימיו תושע יהודה וישראל ישכן לבטח וזה שמו אשר יקראו יהוה צדקנו "In his days shall be saved Judah, and Israel shall dwell in safety, and this his name which (man) shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness." *Jer.* xxxiii. 16, בימים ההם הושע יהודה וירושלם תשכון לבטח וזה אשר יקרא לה יהוה צדקנו. "In those days shall be saved Judah, and Jerusalem shall dwell in safety, and this (name) which (man) shall call her, Jehovah our righteousness."

In altering the common translation of the latter passage, Mr. Brown first disregards the stop after יקרא לה that is "shall call her;" which, by separating the two parts of the sentence, prevents Jehovah from being employed as the agent of the verb "shall call." 2ndly, He entirely neglects the established mode of construction, by leaving זה, or "this," untranslated, and by omitting to point out the name by which Jerusalem should be called. 3dly, He totally overlooks the idiom of the Hebrew, in which verbs are often employed unaccompanied with their agent, when no specific agent is intended, as appears from the following passages:—

Genesis xxv. 26, ואחרי כן וצא אחיו וידו אחזת בעקב עשו ויקרא שמו יעקב "And after that came his brother out, and his hand took hold on Esau's heel, and (man) called his name Jacob." 2*d Samuel* ii. 16, ויחזקו איש בראש רעהו וחרבו בצד רעהו ויפלו יחדו ויקרא למקום ההוא חלקת הצרים אשר בגבעון "And they caught every one his fellow by the

head, and thrust his sword in his fellow's side; so they fell down together: wherefore (man) called that place Helkath Hazurem which is in Gibeon." *Genesis* xvi. 14, על כן קרא לבאר באר לחי ראי "Wherefore (man) called the well Beer-lahai-roi."

They again adduce *Isaiah* xlv. 23, "Unto me (God) every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear"—compared with *Romans* xiv. 10, 12, "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Between the Prophet and the Apostle there is a perfect agreement in substance, since both declare that it is to God that every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess, through him before whose judgment-seat we shall all stand:—for at the same time both Jesus and his Apostles inform us, that we must stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, because the Father has committed the office of final judgment to him.—From this passage, they say, it appears that Jesus swore by himself, and that thereby he is proved to be God, according to the rule, that it is God only that can swear by himself. But how can they escape the context, which expressly informs us, that "the Lord" (Jehovah), and not Jesus, swore in this manner? We must not however overlook what the Apostle says in his epistle to the *Philippians*, ch. ii. 9, 10, 11, where he declares, that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess; but neither must we forget, that Jesus is declared to have been exalted to these honors by God, and that the only confession required is that he is Lord, which office

confession of his dignity is to the glory of God the Father. 9, "Wherefore God also hath highly *exalted* him, and *given* him a name which is above every name; 10, that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, 11, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Some have adopted a most extraordinary way of establishing the deity of Jesus. Any epithet or act, however common it may be, ascribed to God in the sacred writings, and also to Christ in the New Testament, is adduced by them as a proof of his deity; and I observe with the utmost surprize, that the prejudice of many Christians in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity induces them to lay stress upon such sophisms. For instance, *Isaiah* xliii. 3, "For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour"—compared with 2*d Peter* iii. 18, "Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." The conclusion they draw from these passages is, that unless Jesus were God, he could not be a Saviour: but how futile this reasoning is will clearly appear from the following passages; *Nehemiah* ix. 27, "Thou gavest them saviours, who saved them." "*Obad.* 27, "And saviours shall come up on mount Zion." 2*d Kings* xiii. 5, "And the Lord gave Israel a saviour, so they went out from under the hand of the Syrians: and the children of Israel dwelt in their tents, as beforetime." *Isaiah* xix. 19, 20, "In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt: for they shall cry unto the Lord because of the oppressors, and he shall send them a saviour, and a great one,

and he shall deliver them." If this argument possesses any force, then it would lead us to acknowledge the deity not only of Jesus, but that of those different individuals to whom the term "Saviours" or "Saviour" is applied in the above citations. The phrase in *Isaiah*, "Besides me there is no Saviour," is easily accounted for by considering, that all those who have been instrumental in effecting the deliverance of their fellow-creatures from evils of whatever nature were dependent themselves upon God, and only instruments in his hands; and thus all appearance of inconsistence is removed.

Again, *Psalm* xxiii. 1, "Jehovah is my Shepherd"—compared with *John* x. 16, "And other sheep I have, which are not of his fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one Shepherd." In the former text David declared God to be his shepherd or protector; in the latter Jesus represents himself as the one shepherd of the one fold of Christians, some of whom were already attached to him, and others were afterwards to become converts: but Trinitarian writers thus conclude from these passages—if Christ be not one with Jehovah, he could not be called a Shepherd, and thus there would be two shepherds: but a little reflection on the following passages will convince every unbiassed person, that Moses is called a shepherd in like manner, and his followers a flock; and that the term "Shepherd" is applied to others also, without conveying the idea of their unity with Jehovah. *Isaiah* lxiii. 11, "Then he remembered the days of old, Moses, and his people, saying, Where is he that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherd of his flock?" *Ezekiel* xxxiv. 23, 24, "And *I will set up one shepherd* over them, and he shall feed them, even *my servant* David;

he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my *servant David* a prince among them. I the Lord have spoken it." If they insist (though without any ground) upon interpreting the name David as put for Jesus, they must still attribute his shepherdship over his flock to divine commission, and must relinquish the idea of unity between God the employer and the Messiah his *servant*. *Jeremiah* xxiii. 4, "I will set up shepherds over them, which shall feed them: and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord."

Psalm lxxviii. 56, "They tempted and provoked the most high God"—compared with *Cor.* x. 9, "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted."—They thus conclude: the former passage declares the most high God to have been tempted by rebellious Israelites, and in the latter Jesus is represented to have been the person tempted by some of them —consequently Jesus is the most high God. How far cannot prejudice lead astray men of sense! Is it not an insult to reason, to infer the deity of Jesus from the circumstance of his being in common with God tempted by Israel and others? Are we not all, in common with Jesus, liable to be tempted both by men and by Satan? *Hebrews* iv. 15, "For we have not an high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points *tempted like as we are*, yet without sin." *Genesis* xxii. 1, "And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham." Can the liability to temptation common to God, to Jesus, to Abraham, and to all mankind be of any avail to prove the divinity and unity of these respective subjects of temptation?

We find Moses in common with God is spoken against by the rebellious Israelites. *Numbers* xxi. 5, "And the

people (Israel) spoke against God, and against Moses"—Are we to conclude upon this ground, that God as well as Moses is declared to have been spoken against by Israel, that Moses therefore is God himself? In the same text quoted by them, we find the most high God provoked also—(they tempted and provoked the most high God)—so we find Moses and David provoked at different times. *Num.* xxi. 1, "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David;" and *Psalm* cvi. 32, 33, "It went ill with Moses for their sakes: because they provoked his spirit, so that he spake unadvisedly with his lips." Can any one from the circumstance of Moses and David having been the subjects of provocation, in common with God, be justified in attempting to prove the deity of either of them?

Psalm liv. 5, "Thy maker is thine husband, the Lord of hosts is his name"—compared with *John* iii. 29, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom, &c" v. 23, "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church, &c." From these they infer, that as the Church is one bride, so on the other one hand there is one husband, who is termed in one place God, and in another place Christ. My readers will be pleased to examine the language employed in these two instances: in the one, God is represented as the husband of all his creatures, and in the other Christ is declared to be the husband or the head of his followers; there is therefore an inequality of authority evidently ascribed to God and to Jesus. Moreover, Christ himself shews the relation that existed between him and his Church, and himself and God, in *John* xv. 1, "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman"—"I am the vine, ye are the branches."—Would it not be highly unreasonable to set at defiance the distinction drawn by Jesus between God, him-

self, and his Church, and to attempt a conclusion directly contrary to his authority, and unsupported by revelation?

Rev. xxii. 13, " I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last"—compared with *Isaiah* xliv. 6, " Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his redeemer the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God." From a comparison of these verses they conclude, that there is no God besides him who is the first and the last; but Jesus is the first and the last; therefore besides Jesus there is no other God. I must embrace this opportunity of laying before my readers the context of the verse in Revelation, which will, I presume, shew to every unbiassed mind how the verse in question has been misapplied; since the verse cited in defence of the deity of Jesus, when considered in relation to the passages that precede and follow it, most clearly declares his inferiority and his distinct nature from the Father. *Rev.* xxii. 6, " And he (the angel) said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true: and the Lord God of the holy Prophets sent his angel to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly be done. 7 Behold, I come quickly: blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book. 8 And I John saw these things and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel who shewed me these things. 9 Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the Prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God. 10 And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand. 11 He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous,

let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. 12 And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. 13 I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. 14 Blessed are they that do *his* commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. 15 For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolators, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie. 16 I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."

If they ascribe verse 13, ("I am Alpha and Omega, &c.") to Jesus, and not to the angel mentioned in the above passage, they must also unavoidably ascribe to Jesus the passage coming immediately before or after it, including of course verse the 9th, "Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, &c." for there is but one agent described by the pronoun "*He*" in the whole train of the verses above quoted, who is pointed out clearly by the repetition of the phrase, "Behold I come quickly" in verses 7th and 12th. In this case the passage, although it speaks of Jesus as Alpha and Omega, &c. yet must be considered as denying him the divine nature, and ranking him among the chosen servants of God; ("For I am thy fellow-servant.") If they ascribe all the verses of chap. xxii. as far as verse the 16th, to the angel, they cannot justify themselves in founding their conclusion with regard to the Deity of Jesus upon the force of verse the 13th, "I am Alpha and Omega, &c." which in the latter case can bear no relation to Christ, since their system requires them to apply it to an inferior angel. I beg

the attention of my readers to five particular circumstances in this instance. 1st, That the angel whom the Lord sent, as intimated in verse the 6th, was intended to shew his servants in general things that would shortly happen; and the angel sent by Jesus, as found in verse 16th, was to testify to John and other disciples the things relating to the churches. 2dly, Jesus declares in verse 16th and in the subsequent verses that he is the offspring of David, and that it is God that has the power of punishing any one who either takes away from or adds any thing to his revelation. 3dly, That the passage in Revelation xxii. 13 is not parallel to that contained in the prophecy of *Isaiah*, xliv. 6, since the phrase "*Besides me there is no God*," which is found in the latter, and upon which the whole controversy turns, is not contained in the former. 4thly, That when the angel rejected the worship of John addressed to himself, he ordered him to worship God without mentioning the name either jointly or separately of the lamb, by which Jesus is distinguished throughout the Revelation:—"Worship God," ver. 9th. 5thly, In the very next verse, after the speaker, whether Jesus or an angel, describes himself as Alpha and Omega, he uses the expression, "blessed are they that do *his* commandments," clearly indicating the existence of another being to whose *commandments* obedience is required.

It is worth noticing here, that the terms "Alpha and Omega, beginning and end," are in a finite sense justly applicable to Jesus as the first of all created existences, and the last of those who will be required to resign the authority with which he is invested by the Father. See *Colossians* i. 15, "The first-born of every creature." 1 *Corinthians*

xv. 28, "Then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him."

Isaiah xl. 10, "Behold, the Lord God will come with a strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him"—is compared with *Revelation* xxii, 12, "I come quickly; and my reward is with me." From the circumstance of the common application of the phrase "his reward is with him" to God and to Jesus, they infer the deity of the latter; in answer to which I beg to refer my readers to the foregoing paragraphs illustrating verse 11th, which immediately precedes the verse in question of the *Revelation*, and also to *John* v. 30, 22, "As I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me. The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son"—and to *Matthew* xvi. 27, "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Do not these passages point out evidently, that the power of exercising judgment and of distributing rewards *has been given* to Jesus by the Almighty, and that Jesus possesses this authority in behalf of the *Father* of the universe?

Ephesians iv. 8, "When he (Christ) ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men"—compared with *Psalm* lxviii. 18, "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them." The Jews are of opinion that David in this verse spoke of Moses, who when he ascended to Mount Sinai received gifts, i. e. the divine com-

mandments) for men, even for the rebellious Israelites; in this case the Apostle Paul in his epistle, must have applied the verse in an accommodated sense to Jesus. The verse in the Psalm may be directly applied to Jesus, who, on his ascension, received gifts of pardon even for those who had rebelled against him. Mr. Brown, a celebrated Trinitarian Commentator, and several others, consider the 18th verse in this *Psalm*, and verse 8th in this chapter of *Ephesians*, as immediately applicable to Jesus as the Messiah. But another writer, Mr. Jones, with a view to establish the deity of Christ by a comparison of *Ephesians* iv. 8, with *Psalm* lxviii. 18, omits carefully the latter part of the verse, ("Thou hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them,") which is altogether inapplicable to God, and quotes only the first part of the verse, ("thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive;") and thence draws this conclusion—"The Scripture here (in the Epistle referred to) expressly affirms the person who ascends, &c. to be the Lord God." From a view of the whole verse, the sense must, according to this mode of reasoning, be as follows—"The person who ascended on high, and who *received* gifts for men, *that the Lord God* might dwell among them, is the Lord God"—an interpretation, which as implying that the Lord God ascended and received gifts from a Being of course superior to himself, in order that he might dwell among men, is equally absurd and unscriptural.

Zechariah xii. 10, as found in the English version, "In that day they shall look upon me whom they have pierced"—compared with *John* xix. 37, "They shall look on him whom they pierced;"—from which comparison he has thus concluded—"As it stands in the Prophet, the Lord

Jehovah was to be pierced; so that unless the man Christ who hung upon the cross was also the Lord Jehovah, the Evangelist is found to be a false witness, in applying to him a prophecy that could not possibly be fulfilled in him." In order to shew the source of Mr. Jones's error, I beg to lay before my readers the verse in Hebrew, and a translation thereof from the Arabic Bible, as well as a correct translation into English.

ושפכתי על בית דויד ועל יושב ירושלם רוח חן ותחנונים
והביטו אלי את אשר דקרו וספדו עליו כמספד על היחיד
והמר עליו כהמר על הבכור

واصب على بيت داود وعلى سكان اورشليم
روح النعمة والرافة وينظرون الى من اجل
انهم رفضوا وينوحون عليهم مناحة مثل
على وحيد ويتوجعون وجعا مثل على بكر

"And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication: and they shall look *toward me on account of him whom* they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his own son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born." This translation is strongly confirmed by the Septuagint, whose words I subjoin with a literal rendering—

Καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με, ανθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο

"And they shall look *towards me*, on *account* of those whom they pierced."

In the Prophet the Lord speaks of Israel at the approach of their restoration, when they will look up to God for mercy on account of their cruelty to the Messiah, whom they pierced, and for whom they will mourn and

lament. Hence the prophecy in question has been fulfilled in Jesus, without representing the Lord (Jehovah) as the object pierced; and consequently no false testimony is chargeable upon John the Evangelist, who, by changing the object of the verse from "me" found in the Hebrew and Septuagint into "him," we may suppose had in view the general import rather than the particular expressions of the prophecy, pointing out that they looked to the Messiah also, whom they had pierced. Without referring to the Hebrew phrase, which shews beyond doubt the inaccuracy of the English translation of the verse, common sense is, I presume, sufficient to shew, that since in the last two clauses in the verse under consideration the Lord God speaks of the Messiah in the third person—("for him, they (i. e. the Israelites) will mourn and lament") he must be supposed to have spoken of the same third person as pierced by them unjustly, and thus to have pointed out the cause of their lamentation. If Jehovah had been pierced, he would have been mentioned throughout in the first person, also as the object of lamentation and bitterness.

1*st Pet.* ii. 6, "Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, *I lay in Zion* a chief corner-stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. 7 Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them who are disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, 8 And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also they were appointed;"—compared with *Isaiah* xxviii. 16, "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, *I lay in Zion* for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation; he that believ-

eth shall not make haste;" and *Isaiah* viii. 13, "Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. 14 And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence, to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem."

These passages shew, that the Lord God placed the Messiah as a corner-stone for the temple, and that whoever stumbles at that stone so exalted by the Almighty, stumbles at or disobeys him who has thus placed it. But Mr. Jones omits the words found in 1*st Pet.* ii. 6, and *Isaiah* xxviii. 16, "I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, precious," &c. which shew the created nature of the Messiah, and after quoting a part of verse 7th and 8th of 1 *Pet.* chap. ii. ("The stone which the builder disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence,") and only verse 13th and part of the 14th of chapter viii. of *Isaiah*, he has thus concluded—"This stone of stumbling and rock of offence, as it appears from the latter text, (the text in *Peter*,) is no other than Christ, the same stone which the builders rejected. Therefore Christ is the Lord of hosts himself."—Here the Apostle *Peter*, in conformity with the Prophet, represents God as the founder of the corner stone, and Jesus as the same corner stone, which, though it be disallowed by the Jews, yet is *made* by the same founder the head of the corner; but the Jews from their disobedience stumbled directly at the stone so exalted, rendering it a stone of stumbling and rock of offence; and hereby they stumbled secondarily at the founder of this stone, and offended the Lord God; who though he was the rock of defence of Israel, (rock of refuge, *Psalm*

xciv. 24,) became a stone of stumbling and rock of offence.

Thus in *Luke* x. 16, Jesus declares to his disciples, "He that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me;" intimating by these words, that contempt for the holy doctrines which Christ commissioned his disciples to teach, argued contempt for him by whom Christ himself was sent; but no one will thence infer the deity of those disciples. In verses 6th and 7th in question, and in verse 4th of the same chapter of *Peter*, ("To whom coming as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious") Jesus is distinctly declared to be "*a* stone of stumbling," "*a* living stone chosen of God;" the indefinite article "a" here denoting that he is only one of many such stones. It is surprizing that Mr. Jones could overlook these phrases, and conclude upon the identity of Jesus with God from metaphorical language, which represents God as "a stumbling stone" of Israel, and Jesus a stumbling stone of those who never believed him. That there is nothing peculiar in Jesus being called a stone or a shepherd, see *Genesis* xlix. 24, where in a metaphorical sense Joseph is called "the shepherd and the stone of Israel."

The Hebrew language, in common with other Asiatic tongues, frequently indulges in metaphor; and consequently the Old Testament, written in that language, abounds with expressions which cannot be taken in their literal sense. This indeed Jesus himself points out in *John* x. 34, 35, 36, in which he justifies the assumption of the title of Son of God, to denote that he was sanctified and sent of the Father, by shewing that in the scriptures the name even of God was sometimes me-

taphorically applied to men of power or exalted rank. Hence we find epithets which in their strict sense in their most common application are peculiar to God, applied to inferior beings, as I have already noticed. But the Scripture avoids affording the least pretext of misunderstanding the real nature of such objects, by various adjuncts and epithets of obvious meaning, quite inapplicable to the Deity. It is melancholy however to observe, how frequently men overlook the idiom of the language of Scripture, and (apparently misled by the force of preconceived notions) set aside every expression that modifies those that suit their peculiar ideas.

Were we to admit common phrases applied both to God and to Jesus as a proof of the divinity of the latter, we must upon the same ground be led to acknowledge the Deity of Moses, of David, and of other Prophets, who are in common with God the subjects of peculiar phrases. Moses in *Deut.* xxx. 15, declares, "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil." So Jehovah declares in *Jeremiah* xxi. 8, "Behold, I set before you the way of life, and the way of death." In conformity to this mode of argument adopted by Trinitarian writers, we should thus conclude from these passages—unless Moses were one with Jehovah, he could not in his own name employ the same authoritative phrase which is used by Jehovah. In the same manner the term worship is equally applied to God and David in *Chronicles* xxix. 20, "And David said to all the congregation, Now bless the Lord your God. And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the king."—Whence, according to their mode of argument, every one must find himself justified in drawing the

following conclusion—God is the only object of worship —but the term worship is in the Bible applied to David—David must therefore be acknowledged as God.

I have now noticed all the arguments founded on scripture that I have heard of as advanced in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, except such as appeared to me so futile as to be unworthy of remark; and in the course of my examination have plainly stated the grounds on which I conceive them to be inadmissible. Perhaps my opinions may subject me to the severe censure of those who dissent from me, and some will be ready to discover particular motives for my presuming to differ from the great majority of Christian teachers of the present day in my view of Christianity, with the doctrines of which I have become but recently acquainted.—Personal interest can hardly be alleged as likely to have actuated me, and therefore the love of distinction or notoriety may perhaps be resorted to, to account for conduct which they wish it to be believed honest conviction could never direct.—In reply to such an accusation I can only protest in the most solemn manner, that even in the belief that I have been successful in combating the doctrine of Trinitarians, I cannot assume to myself the smallest merit:—for what credit can be gained in proving that one is not three, and that the same being cannot be at once man and God; or in opposing those who maintain, that all who do not admit doctrines so incomprehensible must be therefore subjected by the All-merciful to eternal punishment?—It is too true to be denied, that we are led by the force of the senses to believe many things that we cannot fully understand. But where the evidence of sense does not compel us, how can we believe what is not only beyond our comprehension, but contrary to it and to the common course of na-

ture, and directly against revelation; which declares positively the unity of God, as well as his incomprehensibility; but no where ascribes to him any number of persons, or any portion of magnitude? *Job* xxxvi. 26, "Behold God is great, and we know him not." xxxvii. 23, "Touching the Almighty, we cannot find him out." *Psalm* cxlv. 3, "His greatness is unsearchable." Neither are my attempts owing to a strong hope of removing early impressions from the breasts of those, whose education instilled certain ideas into their minds from the moment they became capable of receiving them; for notwithstanding great and long continued exertions on my part to do away Hindoo polytheism, though palpably gross and absurd, my success has been very partial. This experience therefore, it may be suggested, ought to have been sufficient to discourage me from any other attempt of the kind; but it is my reverence for Christianity, and for the author of this religion, that has induced me to endeavour to vindicate it from the charge of polytheism as far as my limited capacity and knowledge extend. It is indeed mortifying to my feelings to find a religion, that from its sublime doctrines and pure morality should be respected above all other systems, reduced almost to a level with Hindoo theology, merely by human creeds and prejudices; and from this cause brought to a comparison with the paganism of ancient Greece; which while it included a plurality of Gods, yet maintained that θεὸς ἐστὶ εἷς, or "God is one," and that their numerous divine *persons* were all comprehended in that one Deity.

Having derived my own opinions on this subject entirely from the Scriptures themselves, I may perhaps be excused for the confidence with which I maintain them against those of so great a majority, who appeal to the

same authority for theirs; in as much as I attribute the different views, not to any inferiority of judgement compared with my own limited ability, but to the powerful effects of early religious impressions; for when these are deep, reason is seldom allowed its natural scope in examining them to the bottom. Were it a practice among Christians to study first the books of the Old Testament as found arranged in order, and to acquire a knowledge of the true force of scriptural phrases and expressions without attending to interpretations given by any sect—and then to study the New Testament, comparing the one with the other; Christianity would not any longer be liable to be encroached upon by human opinions.

I have often observed that English divines, when arguing with those that think freely on religion, quote the names of Locke and Newton as defenders of Christianity; but they totally forget that the Christianity which those illustrious persons professed did not contain the doctrine of the Trinity, which our divines esteem as the fundamental principle of this religion. For the conviction of the public as to the accuracy of this assertion, I beg to be allowed to extract here a few lines of their respective works, referring my readers to their publications upon religion for more complete information.

Locke's Works, vol. 7, page 421, "But that neither he nor others may mistake my book, this is that in short which it says—1st, That there is a faith that makes men Christians—2dly, That this faith is the believing "Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah"—3rdly, That the believing Jesus to be the Messiah, includes in it a receiving him for our Lord and King, promised and sent from God; and so lays upon all his subjects an absolute and indispensible necessity of

assenting to all that they can attain of the knowledge that he taught, and of sincere obedience to all that he commanded."

Sir I. Newton's Observations upon the Prophecies, page 262. "The Beasts and Elders therefore represent the Christians of all nations; and the worship of these Christians in their churches is here represented under the form of worshipping God and the Lamb in the Temple. God for his benefaction in creating all things, and the Lamb for his benefaction in redeeming us with his blood:—God as sitting upon the throne and living for ever, and the Lamb exalted above all by the merits of his death."

It cannot be alleged that these personages, in imitation of several Grecian Philosophers, published these sentiments only in conformity to the vulgar opinion, and to the established religion of their country; for both the vulgar opinion and the religion of the government of England in their days were directly opposite to the opinions which these celebrated men entertained.

The mention of the name of Sir Isaac Newton, one of the greatest mathematicians (if not the greatest) that ever existed, has brought into my recollection, a mathematical argument which I some time ago heard a divine adduce in support of the Trinity, and which I feel inclined to consider here, though I am afraid some of my readers may censure me for repeating an argument of this kind. It is as follows: that as three lines compose one triangle, so three persons compose one Deity. It is astonishing that a mind so conversant with mathematical truth as was that of Sir Isaac Newton, did not discover this argument in favor of the possible existence of a Trinity, brought to light by Trinitarians, considering that it must have lain so much

in his way. If it did occur to him, its force may possibly have given way to some such considerations as the following.—This analogy between the Godhead and a triangle, in the first instance, denies to God, equally with a line, any real existence; for extension of all kinds, abstracted from position or relative situation, exists only in idea. Secondly, It destroys the unity which they attempt to establish between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; for the three sides of a triangle are conceived of as separate existences. Thirdly, It denies to each of the three persons of God, the epithet "God," inasmuch as each side cannot be designated a triangle; though the Father of the universe is invariably called God in the strict sense of the term. Fourthly, It will afford to that sect among Hindoos who suppose God to consist of four persons or চতুর্ব্যূহাত্মক, an opportunity of using the same mode of arguing, to shew the reasonableness of their sentiments, by comparing the compound Deity with the four sides of a quadrilateral figure. Fifthly, This manner of arguing may be esteemed better adapted to support the polytheism of the majority of Hindoos, who believe in numerous persons under one Godhead; for instead of comparing the Godhead with a triangle, a figure containing the fewest sides, and thereby proving the three persons of the Godhead, they might compare God with a polygon, more suitable to the dignified rank of the Deity, and thus establish the consistency with reason of the belief, that the Godhead may be composed of numerous persons. Sixthly, This mode of illustration would, in fact, equally suit the atheist as the polytheist. For as the Trinity is represented by the three sides of a triangle, so the eternal revolution of nature without any divine person may be compared to the circle, which is considered as having no

sides nor angles ; or Seventhly, as some great mathematicians consider the circle as a polygon, having an infinite number of sides, the illustration of the Trinitarian doctrine by the form of the triangle will by analogy justify those sects, who maintain the existence of an infinite number of persons in the Godhead, in referring for an illustration of their opinions to the circular, or rather perhaps to the globular figure, in which is to be found an infinity of circles, formed each of an infinite number of sides.

As I was concluding this Appendix, a friend to the doctrine of the Trinity kindly lent me Serle's "Horæ solitariæ." I confine here my attention only to four or five arguments, which the author has adduced in the beginning of his work, and that for several reasons. 1st, Because a deliberate attention to the nature of the first-mentioned arguments may furnish the reader with a general idea of the rest, and justify me in neglecting them. 2ndly, Because such of the others as seem to me at all worthy of notice have been already considered and replied to ; and 3rdly, Because I am unwilling to protract further discussion, which has already grown to a length far beyond my original intention.

At page 10. Mr. Serle alleges, that "God says by Moses in the book of Genesis, In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth ; and then just afterwards, the Spirit moved upon the face of the waters. Here are three persons in one power ; the beginning, God, and the Spirit." If a bare mention of the word "beginning" and "spirit," (or properly speaking "wind,") in the two first verses of Genesis, justifies the numbering of them as two persons of God, how can we conscientiously omit the "water" mentioned in the same verse as coexistent with "spirit,"

making it the fourth person, and darkness, which is mentioned before Spirit, as a fifth person of God: and if under any pretence we are justified in classing "beginning," an abstract relation, as a person of God, how can we deny the same dignity to the "end," which is equally an abstract relation? Nay, the very words of chap. i. 8, of Revelations might be quoted to prove one of the persons of God to be the "ending:"— "I am Alpha and Omega, the BEGINNING and the ENDING, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." We have then God, the Beginning, the Spirit, and the Ending, four persons at least whom we must admit into the Godhead, if Mr. Serle's opinion have any foundation.

Page 12. "They (the ancient Chaldee Jews and Cabalists) expressed their idea of the Trinity by this particular type where the three jods denote Jah, Jah, Jah, or that each of three persons (according to our Athanasian creed) is by himself Jah or Lord:—the point ַ (kametz) as common to each, implies the divine nature in which the three persons equally existed; and the circle, inclosing all, was intended to exhibit the perfect unity, eternity, and conjunction of the whole Trinity." This type, if it existed at any time, can bear various interpretations, Theistical, Polytheistical, or Atheistical; but in Hebrew and Chaldee, the sign which is generally used to denote the Deity has two jods only; a reference to the Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos, written in the Chaldee language, and to other Targums in Hebrew and Chaldee, will establish the fact beyond doubt. This practice, which according to Mr. Serle's mode of arguing, establishes the duality of God, is entirely overlooked by him.

In the same page again he says, that "in a very ancient book of the Jews, the first person, or Hypostasis, is described as כתר Kather, the crown, or admirable and profound intelligence; the second person חכמה Chochma, wisdom, or the intelligence illuminating the creation, and the second glory; and the third person בינה Binah or the sanctifying intelligence, the worker of faith and the father of it." He immediately after this assertion notices in page 13, "they believed, taught, and adored three primordial existences in the Godhead, which they called sometimes מדות middoth or *properties*, and sometimes ספירות sephiroth or *numerations*." The force of truth here impels the author to contradict himself directly; since he at one time asserts that the Jews believed them to be the three *persons* of God, and again forgetting what he said, he affirms that the Jews called them *properties*, or *numeration* of properties. The fact is, that when the intercourse between the Jews and Greeks was great, the former, in imitation of some of the latter, entertained the idea that the supreme Deity used ten superior intelligences or qualities in the creation of the world; namely, כתר Crown—חכמה Wisdom—בינה Understanding—גדלה Greatness—גבורה Mightiness—תפארת Beauty—נצח Everlasting—הוד Glory—יסוד Foundation—מלכות Kingdom.* But a Godhead consisting of ten persons not suiting Mr. Serle's hypothesis, he omits the seven last, and mentions only the three first, which he denominates a proof of the trinity.

In page 14. Mr. Serle represents "R. Simeon and the famous Jonathan treating upon the Trisagion, or thrice holy, in the 6th chapter of *Isaiah*," as saying, "that the first

* This opinion is still to be found in the conversation as well as writings of the learned amongst Eastern theologians.

Holy implies the Father, the second Holy the Son, and the third Holy the Holy Ghost." I therefore give the commentary of Jonathan*, which I have been so fortunate as to procure, in order to shew how zeal in behalf of the trinity has sometimes led men to forget the claims of care and prudence. Jonathan's targum on the term "Holy" thrice repeated in *Isaiah* vi. 3. is as follows: קדיש בשמי מרומא עלאה בית שכנתיה קדיש על ארעא עובד גבורתיה קדיש לעלם ולעלמי עלמיא "Holy in the most high heavens, the place of his glory—Holy upon the earth, the work of his power—Holy for ever and ever and ever."

Again in page 14. he says, that "The Jews before Christ had a title for the Godhead consisting of twelve letters, which Maimonides, the most learned of all their writers, owns to have been a compounded name, or name (as was common among the Rabbins) composed of the initial letters of other names. Galatinus from R. Hakkadosh (who lived about A. D. 150, or rather from Porchetus Salvaticus, or Raymundus Martini) believes that these twelve letters were אב, בן ורוח הקדש, i. e. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

There is no impossibility in the existence of a name of God consisting of twelve letters, as is stated to have been the case on the authority of Maimonides, because we find different names of God, consisting of various numbers of letters. But Mr. Serle, on the authority of Galatinus, a Christian writer, represents these twelve letters as expressing the names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. I therefore make a few remarks on this head. 1st, Mr. Serle

* The copy which is now in my hands was printed in London by Thomas Roycrott in the year 1656. It contains, besides the targum of Jonathan, the original Hebrew text, together with the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic translations, each accompanied with a Latin interpretation.

himself expresses his doubts respecting the source from which Galatinus had obtained his information, "*whether from R. Hakkadosh, from Porchetus Salvaticus, or from Raymundus Martini.*" 2ndly, The construction of this sentence of twelve letters, is conformable to the European style of writing, but is quite foreign to Hebrew idiom, which requires a conjunction expressed before בן or Son; but the omission of this shews that it must have been invented by one more accustomed to the idiom of European languages, than to that of the Hebrew. 3rdly, Maimonides, the original authority of Mr. Serle, owns that these twelve letters were the initials of other names; whereas Mr. Serle in the explanation of them represents them as composing in themselves three complete names, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, instead of giving a name for each of the twelve letters.

I am not aware how many arguments and illustrations of similar weight and importance to those already discussed may still remain, that have not been brought to my notice; but I trust the inquiry has proceeded sufficiently far to justify me in still adhering to the unity of God as the doctrine taught alike in the Old and in the New Testaments.

I now conclude this Appendix, with repeating my prayer, that a day may soon arrive, when religion shall not be a cause of difference between man and man, and when every one will regard the Precepts of Jesus as the sole Guide to Peace and Happiness.

P. S. Dr. Prideaux, in the fourth volume of his "Connection," (which has very lately come into my hands,) takes a different view of Isaiah ch. ix. verses 6 and 7, from that which has been offered in the preceding pages. After quoting the words of the prophet according to the English version, he says, "Christians all hold that this is spoken of the Messiah; and Jonathan, in the Targum which is truly his, doth on that place say the same." Hereby he gives out that this prophecy, including the epithets "Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, and the prince of peace," is applied by Jonathan, as by Christians, to the Messiah:—I therefore give here the explanation given by Jonathan to verses 6 and 7, which will sufficiently shew the error Dr. Prideaux has committed.

אמר נביא לבית דוד ארי דבי אתיליד לנא בר אתיהיב לנא
וקביל אוריתא עלוהי למטרא ואתקרי שמיה מן קדם מפליא
עצה אלהא גברא קים לעלמיא משיחא דשלמא יסגי עלנא
בימוהי: סגי רבו לעבדי אוריתא ולנטרי שלמא ליתכוף על
כורסי דוד ועל מלכותיה לאתקנא יתה ולמבנה בדינא
ובזכותא מכען ועד עלמא במימרא דיי צבאות תתעבד דא:

"The prophet says, to the house of David a child is born, to us a son is given, and he will take upon himself the preservation of the law; from the presence of the causer of wonderful counsels, the great God enduring for ever, his name will be called the anointed (in Heb. Messiah), in whose days peace shall be multiplied upon us." "Greatness shall be multiplied to those who obey the law, and to those who keep peace, there will be no end to the throne of David and of his government: for establishing and for building it with judgment and with justice now and for ever."

Here Jonathan, in direct opposition to Christians, denies to the son so born the epithets "wonderful, counsellor, mighty God, and everlasting Father;" and applies to him only the title of "the prince of peace" (nearly synonymous with Messiah,) on account of his preserving peace during his reign, as was promised of the Messiah. (2 Kings xx. 19, "Is it not good (says Hezekiah) if peace and truth be in my days?" 2 Chronicles xxxii. 26. "The wrath of the Lord came not upon them in the days of Hezekiah.") This application of the term anointed (or Messiah) is made to Hezekiah in the same manner as to other eminent kings, often called Messiah in the sacred writings:—1 Samuel xii. 3. "Behold here I am! witness against me before the Lord, and his anointed (or his Messiah) the king." 2 Samuel xxiii. 1. "David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the Messiah of the God of Jacob, &c." xxii. 51. "He is the tower of salvation for his King, and sheweth mercy to his Messiah, unto David, and to his seed for evermore." 1 Samuel ii. 10. "The Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength unto his King, and exalt the horn of his Messiah." Psalm xx. 6. "Now know I that the Lord saveth his Messiah." Isaiah xlv. 1. "Thus saith the Lord to his Messiah, to Cyrus." The reign of Hezekiah was so accompanied with peace and success that some Jewish commentators entertained the opinion, that Hezekiah was really the last Messiah promised by God.

R. Hillel, אמר רבי הלל אין להם משיח לישראל שכבר אכלוהו בימי חזקיה:

"There is no Messiah for the Israelites, for they enjoyed it (i. e. they had him) at the time of Hezekiah."

If Trinitarians still insist, in defiance of the above authorities, and under pretence of the word "anointed" or

"Messiah" found in the Targum of Jonathan, that his interpretation should be understood of the expected Messiah, then as far as depends upon the interpretation given by him of verses 6 and 7, they must be compelled to relinquish the idea that he expected a divine deliverer. Moreover, all other celebrated Jewish writers, some of whom are more ancient than Jonathan, apply the passage in question to Hezekiah, some of them differing however from him in the application of the epithets contained in verse 6.

Talmud Sanhedrim, 11 Ch. "God said, Let Hezekiah, who has five names, take vengeance upon the king of Assyria, who has taken upon himself five names also." R. Sholomo follows the annotation made by Shammai. "For a child is born, &c. Though Ahaz was wicked, his son, who was born to him to be a king in his stead, shall be righteous, the government of God and his yoke shall be on his shoulder, because he shall obey the law and keep the commandments thereof, and shall incline his shoulder to the burthen of God.—And he calls his name, &c. God, who is the wonderful counsellor, and the mighty and everlasting Father, called his name the prince of peace, for peace and truth shall be in his days*."

The reader will not suppose the application of the terms "wonderful counsellor, mighty God, everlasting Father, and prince of peace" to Hezekiah to be unscriptural,

* It is worth noticing, that "to be called" and "to be" do not invariably signify the same thing; since the former does not always imply that the thing is in reality what it is called, but the use of it is justified when the thing is merely *taken notice of* in that view. See Luke i. 36. "This is the sixth month with her who was called (that is, reputed) barren." Isaiah lxi. 3. "That they might be called (or accounted) trees of righteousness." This is more especially the case when the phrase "to be called" has for its subject not a person, but the *name* of a person. See Deuteronomy xxv. 10. "And his name shall be called in Israel, *the house of him that* hath his shoe loosed." Genesis xlviii. 16. "Let my name be named on them."

when he refers to page 139 of this work, and considers the following passages, in which the same epithets are used for human beings, and even for inanimate objects.—2 Chronicles ii. 9, "The house which I am about to build shall be wonderful great." Micah iv. 9, "Is there no king in thee? is thy counsellor perished?" Genesis xxiii. 6, "Hear us: thou art a mighty prince amongst us." Judges ix. 13, "Should I leave my wine which cheereth God and man," that is, master and servant. 2 Thess. ii. 4, "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God." Gen. xlix. 26, "To the utmost bound of the everlasting hills." 1 Samuel iv. 8, "Who shall deliver us out of the hands of these mighty gods?" which Cruden interprets of the Jewish ark. Isaiah xii. 11—28, "Therefore I have profaned the princes of the sanctuary."

I wonder how those who found their opinion respecting the Trinity on terms applied in common to God and creatures, can possibly overlook the plain meaning of the term "Son" or "Only-begotten," continually applied to the Saviour throughout the whole of the New Testament; for should we understand the term God, in its strict sense, as denoting the First Cause, (that is, a being not born nor begotten,) we must necessarily confess that the idea of God is as incompatible with the idea of the "Son" or "only-begotten," as entity is with non-entity; and therefore that to apply both terms to the same being will amount to the grossest solecism in language.

As to their assertion, that there are found in the Scriptures two sets of terms and phrases, one declaring the humanity of Jesus and another his deity, and that he must therefore be acknowledged to have possessed a twofold nature, human and divine, I have fully noticed it in pp. 24, 109, 140, pointing out such passages as contain two sets of

terms and phrases applied also to Moses and even to the chiefs of Israel and to others ; and that, if it is insisted upon, that each word in the sacred writings should be taken in its strict sense, Moses and others, equally with the Saviour, must be considered as gods, and the religion of the Jews and Christians will appear as polytheistical as that of heathens.

Although there is the strictest consistency between all the passages in the sacred books, Trinitarians with a view to support their opinion charge them first with inconsistency, and then attempt to reconcile the alleged contradiction by introducing the doctrine of the union of two natures, divine and human, in one person, forgetting that at the same time the greatest incongruity exists between the nature of God and man, according to both revelation and common sense.

If Christianity inculcated a doctrine which represents God as consisting of three persons, and appearing sometimes in the human form, at other times in a bodily shape like a dove, no Hindoo in my humble opinion who searches after truth can conscientiously profess it in preference to Hindooism ; for that which renders the modern Hindoo system of religion absurd and detestable, is that it represents the divine nature though one (একং ব্রহ্ম), as consisting of many persons, capable of assuming different forms for the discharge of different offices. I am however most firmly convinced, that Christianity is entirely free from every trace of polytheism whether gross or refined. I therefore enjoy the approbation of my conscience in publishing the precepts of this religion as the source of peace and happiness.

FINIS.

FINAL APPEAL

TO

THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC,

IN DEFENCE OF THE

"PRECEPTS OF JESUS."

BY

RAMMOHUN ROY.

Calcutta:

PRINTED AT THE UNITARIAN PRESS, DHURMTOLLAH.

1823.

NOTICE.

All the preceding works of the author on the subject of Christianity were printed at the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta; but the acting proprietor of that press having, since the publication of the Second Appeal, declined, although in the politest manner possible, printing any other work that the author might publish on the same subject, he was under the necessity of purchasing a few types for his own use, and of depending principally upon native superintendance for the completion of the greater part of this work. This must form an apology to the public for the imperfections that may appear in its typographical execution.

ERRATA.

Page.	*Line.*	*for.*	*read.*
8	14	scared	sacred.
34	23	hs	his.
38	23	destroy	destroy them.
39	5	CXIII	CXLI.
44	9	V	II.
48	9	obssrved	observed.
54	25	comparsion	comparison.
66	25	XLII	XLII 21.
69	12	60	30.
—	25	13	23.
70	24	1	2.
—	25	blood for him	blood be shed for him.
75	2	which is	which it is.
78	13	enemity	enmity.
93	15	11.	13.

Page.	*Line.*	*for.*	*read.*
97	11	13	16.
99	12	indentify	identify.
107	29	horrows	harrows.
112	18	allussion	allusion.
—	19	at loss	at a loss.
115	5	eightth	eighth.
122	12	myest	mayest.
124	1	begining	beginning.
125	14	V	I.
126	4	begining	beginning.
132	26	Psalm 3—5	Psalm III 3—5.
135	5	manes	names.
138	4	and holy	and an holy.
143	2	chosed	chose.
—	11 *del.*	a.	
—	18	8	7.
145	14	apostle	apostles.
153	23	is	was.
154	22	49	19.
—	23	19	49.
160	22	XII	XI.
163	19	act	art.
166	17	15	16.
167	7	Zion	Zidon.
170	20 *del.*	could.	
— *note*	1	Shiloah	Shiloh.
173	19	me	myself.
174	16	Hosia	Hosea.
175	13	know—heated	knew—healed.
177	10	Peeka	Pekah.
180	14	XI	IX.
—	21	whether so ever	whithersoever.
181	12	noticed	noticed in
184	1	cion	icon.
—	2	emherors	emperors.
187	13	to	even to.
192	1	32	22.
198	28	he	be.
203	20	prophet	prophets.
—	—	servant	servants.

Page.	*Line.*	*for*	*read.*
207	9	meraly	merely.
208	28	kingdom	kingdoms.
209	9	on his thigh	on his vesture and on his thigh.
216	25	gloriously	glorious.
218	7	scriptures	scripture.
220	17	not	not me.
229	17	shall	shalt.
235	14	warred	roared.
236	10	whether	whither.
238	5 *del.*	that of.	
240	7	a servant	of a servant.
246	28	see	see me.
253	18	said	had said.
255	24 *del.*	as.	
260	19	as	as head over.
262	17	page	page 122.
—	25	the beginning	the Amen—the beginning.
277	22	desciples	disciples.
286	27 *del.*	a	
288	11	carrys	carries.
295	25	comprehention	comprehension.
299	1	*was God*	*was with God.*
301	8	ὁ	ὁ.
—	15	εγενετο	εγενετο.
303	11	the seek	seek the.
316	26	corrobate	corroborate.
319	12	πλυνειτα	πλυνει τα.
328	27	coroborated	corroborated.
332	15	XXXII 32	V 31.
339	11	15	14.
356	8	he	be.
367	17	terally	literally.
379	1	tyrrany	tyranny.

PREFACE.

NOTWITHSTANDING the apprehension of exciting displeasure in the breasts of many worthy men, I feel myself obliged to lay before the public at large this my selfdefence, intitled "A FINAL APPEAL to the Christian Public." I however confidently hope that the liberal among them will be convinced, by a reference to the first part of this Essay and to my two former Appeals, that the necessity of selfvindication against the charge of being an "injurer of the cause of truth," has compelled me, as a warm friend of that cause, to bring forward my reasons for opposing the opinions maintained by so large a body of men highly celebrated for learning and piety; a consideration which, I trust, will induce them to regard my present labours with an eye of indulgence.

I am well aware that this difference of sentiment has already occasioned much coolness towards me in the demeanour of some whose friendship I hold very dear; and that this protracted controversy has not only prevented me from rendering my humble services

to my countrymen, by various publications, which I had projected in the native languages, but has also diverted my attention from all other literary pursuits for three years past. Notwithstanding these sacrifices, I feel well satisfied with my present engagements, and cannot wish that I had pursued a different course; since whatever may be the opinion of the world, my own conscience fully approves of my past endeavours to defend what I esteem the cause of truth.

In my present vindication of the unity of the Deity, as revealed through the writings of the Old and New Testaments, I appeal not only to those who sincerely believe in the Books of Revelation, and make them the standard of their faith and practice, and who must therefore deeply feel the great importance of the Divine oracles being truly interpreted; but I also appeal to those who, although indifferent about religion, yet devote their minds to the investigation and discovery of truth, and who will therefore not think it unworthy of their attention to ascertain what are the genuine doctrines of Christianity, as taught by Christ and his Apostles, and how much it has been corrupted by the subsequent intermixture of the polytheistical ideas that were familiar

to its Greek and Roman converts, and which have continued to disfigure it in succeeding ages. I extend my appeal yet further; I solicit the patient attention of such individuals as are rather unfavourable to the doctrines of Christianity as generally promulgated, from finding them at variance with common sense, —that they may examine and judge whether its doctrines are really such as they are understood to be by the popular opinion, which now prevails.

I feel assured that if religious controversy be carried on, with that temper and language which are considered by wise and pious men, as most consistent with the solemn and sacred nature of religion, and more especially with the mild spirit of Christianity, the truths of it cannot, for any length of time, be kept concealed, under the imposing veil of high-sounding expressions, calculated to astonish the imagination and rouse the passions of the people, and thereby keep alive and strengthen the preconceived notions, with which such language has in their minds been, from infancy, associated. But I regret that the method which has hitherto been observed in inquiry after religious truth, by means of large publications, necessarily issued at con-

siderable intervals of time, is not, for several reasons, so well adapted to the speedy attainment of the proposed object, as I, and other friends of true religion, could wish.—These reasons are as follows:—

1st. Many readers have not sufficient leisure or perseverance to go through a voluminous Essay, that they may make up their minds and come to a settled opinion on the subject.

2ndly. Those who have time at their command and interest themselves in religious researches, finding the real point under discussion mixed up with injurious insinuations and personalities, soon feel discouraged from proceeding further, long before they can come to a determination.

3rdly. The multiplicity of arguments and various interpretations of numerous scriptural passages, that bear often no immediate relation to the subject or to each other, introduced in succession, distract and dishearten such readers as are not acustomed to Biblical studies, and interrupt their further progress.

As Christianity is happily not a subject resting on vague metaphysical speculations, but is founded upon the authority of books written in languages, which are understood and explained according to known and standing rules, I therefore propose, with a view to the more speedy and certain attainment of religious truth, to establish a monthly periodical publication, commencing from the month of April next, to be devoted to Biblical criticism, and to subject unitarian as well as trinitarian doctrines to the test of fair argument, if those of the latter persuasion will consent thus to submit the scriptural grounds on which their tenets concerning the Trinity are built.

For the sake of method and convenience, I propose that, beginning with the Book of Genesis and taking all the passages in that portion of Scripture, which are thought to countenance the doctrine of the Trinity, we should examine them one by one and publish our observations upon them; and that next month we proceed in the same manner with the Book of Exodus, and so on with all the Books of the Old and New Testaments, in their regular order.

If any one of the Missionary Gentlemen, for himself and in behalf of his fellow labourers, choose to profit by the opportunity thus afforded them of defending and diffusing the doctrines they have undertaken to preach, I request that an Essay on the Book of Genesis of the kind above intimated may be sent me by the middle of the month, and if confined within reasonable limits not exceeding a dozen or sixteen pages, I hereby engage to cause it to be printed and circulated at my own charge, should the Missionary Gentlemen refuse to bestow any part of the funds, intended for the spread of Christianity, towards this object; and also that a reply (not exceeding the same number of pages) to the arguments adduced, shall be published along with it by the beginning of the ensuing month. That this new mode of controversy by short monthly publications may be attended with all the advantages which I, in common with other searchers after truth, expect, and of which it is capable, it will be absolutely necessary that nothing be introduced of a personal nature or calculated to hurt the feelings of individuals—that we avoid all offensive expressions and such arguments as have no immediate connection with the subject and can only serve to retard the progress of discovery; and that we never allow

ourselves for a moment to forget that we are engaged in a solemn religious disputation.

As religion consists in a code of duties which the creature believes he owes to his creator and as "God has no respect for persons; but in *every nation* he that fears him and *works righteousness* is accepted with him," it must be considered presumptuous and unjust for one man to attempt to interfere with the religious observances of others, for which he well knows, he is not held responsible by any law either human or divine. Notwithstanding, if mankind are brought into existence and by nature formed to enjoy the comforts of society and the pleasures of an improved mind, they may be justified in opposing any system, religious, domestic, or political, which is inimical to the happiness of society or calculated to debase the human intellect; bearing always in mind that we are children of ONE Father "who is above *all*, and through *all*, and in us *all*."

Calcutta, January 30, 1823.

Index.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

THANKS to the Reverend Editor for his labours 1
Author's vindication of himself, from the charge of presumption 2
Necessity has driven the Author to these publications ..... ibid
Quotation of a part of "The Introduction to the Precepts of Jesus," in proof of this 3
Author's precaution in the Second Appeal ..... ibid
Quotation of some parts of the First Appeal 4
The assertion of the Editor as to his ignorance of the Author's belief 5
Author's public avowal of his faith 6
Author's vindication of himself from the charge of vanity ..... ibid
Unbiassed common sense suffices to find the unscripturality of the Trinity 7
Experiment proposed ..... ibid
The Editor's ridiculing of the suggestion offered as to the study of the Bible ..... ibid
The reason assigned for his disapproval of the suggestion 8
Impossibility of a belief in the Trinity and Hindoo Polytheism, unless inculcated in youth ..... ibid
No liberal parent can take advantage of the confiding credulity of his children ..... ibid
The duties of liberal parents 9
The force of early acquired prejudices 10
Traditional instructions inculcated in childhood one of the causes of prevailing errors in Christianity 11
The Editor's ironical remarks on the success of the Author in scriptural studies noticed 12
The reason assigned by the Editor, for his omission of several arguments in the Second Appeal, noticed 13
The Editor's position of the insufficiency of the Precepts of Jesus to procure men salvation, noticed 14
The irregular mode of arguing adopted by the Editor 15
The sufficiency of the Precepts of Jesus for salvation proved 16
Mark XII. 29. "Hear O Israel the Lord our God is one Lord" referred to 17
Matt. VII. 24. "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine," referred to ..... ibid
John XV. 10. "If ye keep my Commandments," &c. and v. 14 referred to 18
Matt. XXV. 31 et. seq. referred to ..... ibid
The argument adduced by the Editor to depreciate the weight of the passage "This do and thou shalt live" examined ..... ibid

PAGE
The Editor's question "Did Jesus regard the lawyer as sinless?" answered 20
The verse "If righteousness came by law," &c. explained 21
The Editor's omission to notice those passages that represent repentance as a sufficient means for procuring pardon 22
Luke V. 32, XXIV. 47. XIII. 3, referred to ..... ibid
The parable of the prodigal son, referred to 23
Psalm LI 17. "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit," &c. Ezekiel XVIII. 30, referred to ..... ibid
Prov. XVI. 6. "By mercy and truth iniquity is purged," &c Isaiah I. 18, referred to 24
Human justice referred to ..... ibid

CHAPTER II.

Inquiry into the doctrine of the Christian atonement. A change of arrangement by the Editor 25
Gen III. 15. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, &c. examined ..... ibid
Gen. IV. 4. "The sacrifice offered by Abel, and approved of God, in preference to his brother Cain's, examined 29
John VIII. 56 noticed ..... ibid
Heb. XI. 26 noticed 30
Heb. XI. 4 referred to ..... ibid
How far sacrifices are divine institutions 31
Micah VI. 7 and 8, Hosea VI. 6, Isaiah I. 11 referred to 32
Psalm L 8 referred to 33
Sam. XV. 22, Pro. XXI. 3, Ecc. V. 1 referred to 34
In what sense such expressions as "This man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins," and others like them should be taken.. ibid
Common notions of justice 37
Exod. XX. 5, Matt. XVIII. 8 referred to ..... ibid
Num. XIV. 19, 20, 11. Chro. XXX. 18. 20, Psalm CVI. 23, XXXII. 5 referred to 38
Psalm CXIII. 2, Isaiah LV. 7, Jeremiah VII. 21, 23 referred to 39
Heb X. 4 "It is not possible that the blood of bulls" &c. examined 40
Gen. XXII. 3 referred to 41
Heb. X. 5 is referred to ..... ibid
The death of Jesus was a spiritual and virtual sacrifice 42
Such terms as "sacrifice" "atonement for sin," &c. being familiar to the Jews were adopted by the Apostles ..... ibid
Priesthood without sacrifice exists under the Christian dispensation 43
I. Peter II. 4 and 5. quoted in proof of spiritual sacrifices ..... ibid
Rev. I. 6, XX. 6, I Peter V. 5. referred to. 44
Protestants explain such phrases as "unless ye eat his flesh," &c. in a spiritual sense ..... ibid
The Editor's reference to Noah's sacrifice and God's promise to Abraham and his quoting Job. "I know that my Redeemer liveth," &c. examined 45
Matt. V. 3, 11, Luke XI. 28 referred to 46
Isaiah LXIII. 16, LX. 16 referred to ..... ibid
Job XIX. 24,—26 referred to 47

PAGE

The sense in which the application of the term "Lamb" is made to Jesus, discussed 48
John XXI. 15, Luke X. 3. Gen. XXII. 7 and 8, Jeremiah XI 19. "But I was like a Lamb," &c. referred to 49
The account of the scape-goat, examined 50
Exod. XXVIII. 38 referred to ..... ibid
Psalm II. 1. compared with Acts IV. and Psalm XVI. 8. 11, compared with Acts II. 25, 27, &c. &c. noticed as bearing no relation to the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus 51
Psalm XL. 6, 8 and 9, examined by referring to their context 53
The object of Jesus's mission was to deliver divine instructions .. 54
John X. 17. "Therefore doth my father love me," &c. examined 55
Jesus's aversion to death like many other prophets 56
Matt. XXVI. 36, 42. referred to ..... ibid
Mark XIV. 36, Luke XXII. 42.—44, referred to 57
The assertion of the Editor that "This iniquity, if it be such, the Father willed," examined 58
The Editor's objection to the application of human notions of justice to judge the unsearchable things of God, examined 60
The Editor's applying human notions of justice to Divine things .. 61
The orthodox divines like the Editor have recourse to human notions of justice in their attempt to prove the atonement of Christ 62
Examination of Isaiah, VII. 14. deferred to the subsequent chapter 63
Isaiah XI "And he shall make him of quick understanding, &c. examined ..... ibid
Isaiah XIX. 19 and 20 noticed 64
The Editor's attempt to prove the atonement from the application of the term "Saviour" to Jesus, examined 65
Matt. IX 8, John V. 24, VI. 63, XV. 3 referred to ..... ibid
Answer to the question "when previously to Christ's coming did the Egyptians cry to Jehovah?" &c. ..... ibid
Isa. XXXV. 10. "The ransom of the Lord," &c. examined 66
Isa. XLII. "He shall not cry," &c. "The Lord is well pleased," examined ..... ibid
II. Cor. V. 21 examined 67
Isa. LIII. examined ..... ibid
Answer to the question "Is not our repentence sufficient?" &c... 68
Jeremiah XXIII. XXXI. I Cor. I. 60 examined 69
Ezek XXXIV 3 examined ..... ibid
Dan. IX. 26 examined 70
Hosea III. Joel II 28, Amos IX. noticed 71
Obadiah v. 21 examined ..... ibid
Micah IV. and V. noticed 73
Nahum I. 15, Habakkuk "The just shall live by his faith," compared with Rom. I. Gal. III. 2, noticed 74
Haggai II. examined ..... ibid
Zechariah III. 8 and 9. VI 12 and 13 noticed 75
Malachi III 1. noticed 76
Jesus made no direct declaration respecting the design of his death ..... ibid
Such expressions as "Jesus came to give himself a ransom for many," explained 77
Romans III. 24. "Being justified freely, &c." ch. VIII. 32, 15, 16 and 18, referred to 80

PAGE
Locke's paraphrase on Romans III. 24, quoted..... ibid
Locke's note on the word "Redemption"..... 81
Locke's note on the word "mercy seat" 82
Reference to a few texts explaining the terms "sacrifice," "ransom," "offering," &c. 83
Of a two-fold nature in Christ.. 84
Allusion to the three-fold nature of a Hindoo incarnation.... .. ibid
Solemn denial of ridiculing Christ's intercession 85
The Editor's assertion that "The blood of no mere creature could take away sin," noticed.... .... ibid
The Editor's assertion "As to the appointment of Jehovah by Jehovah, and his atoning for sin" noticed..... 86
Arguments in proof of the finite effects of Christ's appearance on earth, adduced..... 87
The Israelites punished finitely for sins committed against the infinite God..... 88
I. Chro. XXI. 11 and 15, Judges XIII. 1 referred to ..... ibid
Infinite reward for a good act performed for the propitiation of the infinite God..... 90
The phrases "everlasting fire" and "everlasting punishments," explained..... .... ibid
Gen. XVII. 8, XLIX. 26, Hab. III. 6 referred to 91

CHAPTER III.

Inquiry into the doctrine of the Trinity 93
The term Trinity not found in the scriptures ..... ibid
Gen. XLVIII. 16, "The angel which redeemed me" XXXI. 13, "I am the God of Bethel," Exod. III. 2, "In a flame of fire," examined .... ibid
Jud. II. 1, "I brought you out of Egypt," Gen. XXII. 12, "Thou hast not withheld thy son," examined 94
Isaiah LXIII. 9, Ruth IV. 14, Nehe V. 8 referred to 95
An allusion to a three-fold nature of Christ .... ibid
Psalm XCVII. 7, Jud. XIII. 21 and 22, Job I. 6, "The sons of God," &c. referred to..... 96
Jud XIII. 13, II. Sam. XXIV. 16 referred to 97
Isa. X. 4, 7. XXIX. 1, —referred to 98
Mic. IV. 13. V. 1 referred to..... 99
Exod. III. 14. "Thus shalt thou say I am that I am," John VIII. 24. "If ye believe not that I am." v. 58, examined..... ibid
Matt. XXIV. 5. "I am Christ" and John IV. 25, 26 referred to 100
John II. 19 and 21 referred to 101
Ps. LXXXIX. 27 referred to 104
Chro. XIV. 8, and XVIII. 1, 8 referred to 105
Chro. XX. 2, and 3 referred to 106
II. Kings V. 26, 27, Exod XXIII. 21 referred to 108
Prophets performing miracles, sometimes without oral addresses to God .... ibid
John XI. 41 and 42 referred to 109
The phrase "To trust in him" examined .... ibid
Prov. XXXI. 11, and Isaiah XIV. 32 referred to .... ibid
Jere. XVII. 5 explained .... ibid
Psalm XXIV. "The earth is Jehovah's" &c. compared with John I. 3, examined 110

PAGE

Heb. I. 2, Ephe. III 9 referred to; I. Cor. X. 25 and 26 "Whatsoever is sold," &c. compared with Psalm XXIV. 1, examined 111, 112
Heb. I. 2, John III. 35 referred to 113
I. Cor. X. 22. "Do we provoke the Lord," &c examined .. .... ibid
I. Kings XIX. 10 referred to 114
Psalm XXIV. 8 compared with Eph. IV. 8, examined .... ibid
Psalm LXVIII. 18 referred to 116
Locke's note quoted .. .. ibid
Psalm XXXVI. 6, "O Jehovah thou preservest," &c. compared with Col. I. 17. Heb. I. 3, examined 117
John XVII. 2, V. 30, and John XIV. 24, "The word which ye hear," &c. Matt. XXVIII. 18, referred to..... 119
Psalm XLV. 6, as quoted in Heb. I. 8, "Thy throne O God," &c. examined 120
The Editor's substitution of the term "Jehovah" for "God," noticed ..... ibid
Direct application of Psalm XLV. to Solomon, illustrated 121
Psalm CII. 25, 27 referred to 122
Heb I. 10. 12. "Thou Lord in the beginning," &c. examined .. . ibid
Deut. XXXII. 10, Isaiah XLIX. 16, Psalm XLVII. 3, referred to 124
Matt. XXII. 45 referred to .... ibid
The Editor's substitution of the term "Jehovah" for "Lord," noticed 125
The Editor's endeavour to weaken the force of the evidence respecting the changeable nature of Christ 126
I. Cor. XV. 24, 25 and 28 referred to 127
Application of the term "shepherd," examined 128
Isaiah LXIII. 11, Jere. XXIII. 4. "I will set up shepherds over them" referred to..... ..... ibid
Ezek. XXXIV. 23, "I will set one shepherd" &c. examined .. 129
Ephe. IV. 18, compared with Psalm LXVIII. 18, "Thou hast ascended on high" examined 131
Alquoran ch. I. quoted 133
From a Jewish book of prayers, "Sabbath Morning Service," quoted .... ibid
"Jewish Morning Service," quoted 134
Alquoran II. 5 quoted .... ibid
Hosea II. 15. 17, 19, referred to... .... ibid
The context of v. the 18th referred to 136
The Editor's attempt to invalidate the argument founded on John X. 34..... 137
Figurative application of the terms "The sons of God," "The first born of Gods," &c. noticed..... ..... ibid
Luke II. 7, 21, 40, 42. 52, Matt. XI. 19. Mark III. 5. John IV. 6. XII 27, XIII 5, 21, Luke XXII. 44, Mark XIV. 34, Matt. XXVII. 50, Philippians II. 8. referred to..... 138
The commonly received doctrine of Christ's two-fold nature, noticed..... 140
Moses and the chiefs of Israel termed Gods and Men, and equally with Jesus said to have performed most wonderful miracles. ..... ibid
Terms phrases or circumstances strictly applicable to God alone, when ascribed to created beings, to be interpreted in an inferior sense..... 141
The argument of Moses and others being types of Christ, noticed..... 142
Exodus XXV. 8, Deut. VII. 6, X. 15, XIV. 1 referred to .. .. ibid

PAGE
Deut. X. 17, John XX. 17, Psalm XLV. 8 referred to 143
The context of ch. XV. 34, referred to 144
I. Cor. X. 9. " Neither let us tempt Christ" examined ..... ibid
The Editor's last assertion on this subject examined 145
Isaiah LXIII. 5, " mine own arm," and Rev. I. 8. " I am Alpha and Omega," examined 146
Genesis XXV. 30, XLIX. 7, 13, 8, 9, 11 referred to 147
Inconsistency of ascribing to Jesus the following expressions " I will tread them," " Their blood shall be upon my garment" .. 149
Isaiah LIX. 15, 17, Daniel VII. 9 referred to ..... ibid
Revelation I. 8, and it's context examined 150
Psalm LXXVII " He divided the sea." noticed 151
Psalm XCV. " For Jehovah is a great God," examined 152
Examination of John X. 30. " I and my Father are one." deferred 153
Heb III. 3, 4 noticed ..... ibid
Verse 6th referred to 154

SECTION SECOND.

On the Prophets 154
Proverbs VIII. 1 " Doth not wisdom cry, &c." 22, 24, 30 examined 155
Psalm CXXX 7, LXXXV. 10, Numbers XVI. 46 referred to 157
I. John IV. 8, John I. 1, I. Cor. I. V. 24, 30, II. Cor. V 21, Deut. XXVIII. 37, Zech. VIII. 13, Gen. XII. 2, Zech II. 5, referred to 158
Isaiah VI. 1, 10, compared with John XII. 41, examined ..... ibid
The context of verse the 41, referred to 159
Romans XII. 7, 8, Isaiah LXIII. 17, referred to 160
Verse the 41. compared with John VIII 56 161
Deut. XXVIII. 28, XXIX. 4, 1, King XVIII. 37, referred to 163
Isaiah Chapter VII. 14, " behold a virgin shall conceive" compared with Mathew ch. I. 22, 23, examined ..... ibid
The term " shall conceive" considered 165
Genesis XVI. 11, 4, 5, Jer. XXXI. 8, 2. Samuel XI. 5, and Isaiah XXVI. 17, Gen. XXXVIII. 24, referred to ..... ibid
Exodus XXI. 22, II. Kings VIII. 12, amos. I. 13, referred to 166
Isaiah VII. 15, referred to ..... ibid
Micah IV. 10, Isaiah XXIII. 12, referred to 167
The inconsistency between Christ's being possessed of all power in his *human* Capacity, and his not knowing good from evil in *that very Capacity* 168
Luke II. 46, 50, referred to 169
The context of Isaiah VII. 14, compared with II. Kings XVI 5, et seq. referred to ..... ibid
Mathew's reference to Isaiah VII. 14, in his Gospel compared .. 173
Dr. Campbell's authority quoted ..... ibid
Hosea XI. 1, 3, noticed 174
Isaiah IX. 6, " For unto us a Child is born" examined 175
The context of the verse in question compared II. Kings XV. 29, &c. XVIII. 7, &c. referred to 177
The decision left to the public 180

Page

Difference between "to be" and "to be called" noticed 81
The phrases "no end" and "for ever" or "everlasting" examined ..... ibid
Verses 1. 2. of ch IX. of Isaiah applied in an accommodated sense to Jesus ..... ibid
Matthew I. 23. "And they shall call his name Immanuel" explained 182
Christian emperors addressed by the styles "your divinity" "your "Godship" 184
Psalm LXXXIX. 19. examined by a reference to it's [illegible] ..... ibid
Isaiah XXVIII. 16. compared with Isa. VIII 13. I. Peter II. 7 and 8. "The stone which the builders" &c. examined 187
A proof of Christ's changeable nature 188
Isa. XL 3. "Voice of him," &c. and Malachi III 1. examined ..... ibid
Reference to Mark I. 2 and 3 189
The verse in question in the original Hebrew 190
Luke I. 69. John I. 29, 30, referred to 191
Isaiah XL 9. compared with Rev. XXII. 12. examined ..... ibid
Acts XVII. 31. John VIII. 28. XVII. 1 and 2, Heb. I. 8 and 9. shewing that Jesus whether as man, son of man, or son of God, was inferior to the Most High, referred to 193
Isaiah XLIV. 6. compared with Rev I. 8, and XXII. 13. examined 196
Joshua V. 14. Numb. XXII. 31. Daniel II. 46. referred to 197
Rev. III. 14, Colo I. 15. I. Cor. XV. 24. referred to 199
Prophets and Apostles, represented as the searchers of hearts 200
Rev ch XXI. 5. explained 202
Rev. ch XXII. 6, 7. 13. noticed 203
Phrases in Rev I. 1, and XXII. 6. compared 205
Jesus calls himself a Servant of God, addresses Christians as his brothers, &c. 206
Several questions put to shew the inferiority of the Lamb 207
A query in reply to one of the many insinuations of the Editor 209
Isaiah XLV. 23. "unto me every knee shall bow" compared with Rom. XIV. 10, 12, examined 210
John III 30. Heb. V. 23 compared with Isai LIV. 5. examined 213
Jeremiah XXXIII. 16. examined 216
I. Cor. XI. 3, referred to 217
The simple term "Jehovah" exclusively applied to God 218
Jere. V. 22. examined 220
The Editor's position that Jesus "exercised absolute dominion—in no name beside his own," examined 221
John X. 25, referred to ..... ibid
Jeremiah ch. X. 11, examined 222
Heb. IV. 13. examined 224
The reason for the different expressions used by God to the Prince of Tyrus, and to Jesus, explained 225
I. Cor. IV. 5. explained 226
That others besides Jesus were endued with the power of knowing the state of the heart shewn 227
The perishable nature of Jesus and his Kingdom, explained 228
The epithet "Most holy" applied even to inanimate things 229
The Editor's remarks on Hosea XI. 1. noticed 230
Hosea III. 5, examined ..... ibid
Acts II. 21, examined 231
I. Cor. I. 2, examined 232
Lock's paraphrase on I. Cor I. 2, and his note on Roman X. 13 quoted ..... ibid

PAGE
Amos IV. 13, noticed 234
Zechariah III. 2, and II. 8, noticed ..... ibid

CHAPTER IV.

On the Editor's replies to the arguments contained in chap. 2d of the Second Appeal. Christ's posses ing all power as a mediator noticed 239
Mercy ascribed to the Son and justice to the Father according to the trinitarian system, noticed 240
All the power Jesus enjoyed was given unto him by God 242
Attributes peculiar to God never ascribed to Jesus 243
Jesus was like the sun an instrument in the hands of God 245
Performing miracles and enabling others to perform them were not peculiar to Jesus 246
The alleged compound nature of Jesus noticed 249
The terms "for ever" and "everlasting" explained 251
Gen. XVII. 8, Jer. VII. 7, Daniel VII 18, referred to ..... ibid
Philip II. 6, "who being in the form of God" &c. examined 252
The term "first born" explained 257
Exodus IV. 22, XXXI. 9, Psalm LXXXIX. 27, referred to 258
Romans VIII. 29, I. John IV. 7, referred to ..... ibid
Instances wherein Jesus himself and his Apostles spoke of him as a creature 259
Jesus's alleged two natures again noticed 261
The phrase from the beginning noticed ..... ibid
The Editor's introducing the two fold nature of Christ ..... ibid
Inconsistency of God's emptying himself of his glory and offering up supplications for the same to himself 264
John XVII. 22, referred to 265
Micah V. 2, examined ..... ibid
The force of the words "son" and "own son" noticed 268
Psalm LXVII. 6, I. Timo. I. 2, referred to 271
The phrase "only begotten" noticed 272
John X. 30, "I and my father are one" examined 273
One's calling God his father can not amount to his unity in nature with the deity 276
Gen. II. 14, Ezekiel XXXVII. 19, I. Cor. X. 17, referred to ..... ibid
Such phrases as "he in God and God in him" "God dwelleth in him and he in God" noticed 278
John X. 36, containing a disavowal of deity by Christ explained 280
John X examined by it's context 282
Jesus having died under the charge of making himself the Son of God, noticed 285
Hebrews "thy throne O God" originally applied to Solomon again noticed 288
The phrase "for ever" again noticed ..... ibid
John XX. 17, ascribed to Jesus in his human nature 289
According to the Editor one part of the same sentence spoken by Jesus in his divine, and another in his human capacity ..... ibid
John XX. 18, "my Lord and my God" examined 290
John I. 1, "in the beginning was the word, &c." examined 291
Hindoo polytheism compared with that maintained by the Editor .. 301
John XVI. 30, "now are we sure that thou knowest all things" examined 302
Paul "God our Saviour," I. Peter "the righteousness of God" Jude "to the only wise, &c." quoted by the Editor noticed .. 303

PAGE
Perishable nature of fictitious Gods, noticed..... 304
Answers to the Editor's queries..... ibid
The will of God the Father sometimes found at variance with that of the son in Mathew XXVI 39, and Mark XIV. 36,..... 305

CHAPTER V.

Remarks on the replies to the arguments found in chapter third of the Second Appeal.....
The Editor's first position as to the ubiquity of Jesus discussed.. 309
John III. 13. no man hath ascended up, &c. examined..... ibid
Translation of this verse by Dr. Campbell quoted..... 321
Parkhurst's Authority quoted..... 322
Matthew XVIII. 20, "for where two or three gathered." &c. examined 323
The Editor's queries answered..... 324
The Editor's second position as to Jesus's ascribing to himself a knowledge, and an incomprehensibility of nature, equal to God, discussed..... 326
Matthew XI. 27, "no man knoweth the son," &c. examined..... ibid
I. John III. 1, referred to..... 328
The improved version, quoted..... 329
The Editor's third position as to Christ's exercising in an independent manner, the power of forgiving sin, discussed..... ibid
Mark II. 5, Matthew IX. 12, examined 330
Matthew IX. 8, referred to ..... ibid
Acts XXXII. 32, XIII. 38, referred to 332
The Editor's fourth position respecting Almighty power being claimed by Jesus, discussed..... 333
John V. 19, 36, explained..... ibid
The work of judging men is not peculiar to Jesus..... 337
John V 23, separately examined..... 338
Gal. IV. 15, Matthew X. 25, XIX. 19, Gen. III. 22, referred to 339
Matthew XX. 14, noticed..... 340
Matt. XX. 23, referred to..... 341
The Editor's fifth position as to all judgement being committed to Jesus, discussed..... ibid
Mark XIII 32. referred to..... 342
The Editor's sixth position as to Jesus's accepting worship due to God, discussed ..... ibid
The Term "worship" defined 343
The ancient Prophets receiving worship in the same sense that Jesus received it..... 344
Invocation by Stephen, explained 345
Christ's offering worship, prayers and thanks to God, mentioned.. 346
The Father, his Christ, and the apostles acquitted of the charge of encouraging idolatry..... ibid
The Editor's seventh position as to the deity of the Son, and personality of the Holy Ghost from the institution of baptism, discussed 348
Exodus XIV. 30, Chro. XX. 20, Luke III. 16, referred to..... 350
The terms "Son" and "Servant" equally manifest inferiority,..... 352
The Editor's queries answered..... ibid
Matt. ch. XXVIII. 20 examined,..... 353

CHAPTER VI.

On the Holy Spirit and other Subjects..... 354
Brief notice of the Holy Spirit by the Editor, noticed .... ibid

PAGE
Acts X. 38, Luke III. 16, referred to 356
Such expressions as "The Holy Spirit will teach you," &c. noticed 357
Acts V. 3, examined ..... ibid
Matt. ch. X. 40, I. Cor. VIII. 12, referred to 358
Acts X. 20, examined ..... ibid
Isaiah XLVIII. 16, with it's context, examined 359
II. Cor. XIII 14, examined 363
Zech. XII. 10, "And I will pour upon the House of David," &c. examined 364
Parkhurst's Authority, quoted 365
Exodus I. 1, Gen. XLIV. 4, IV. 1, Deut. VII. 8, referred to ... 367
Zech. XIII. 7, "Awake, O Sword, against my Shepherd", examined 369
Romans IX. 5, "God blessed for ever," examined ..... ibid
I. Cor. VIII. 6, Ephes. I. 17, IV. 5 and 6, referred to 370
I. John V. 20, "This is the true God," examined 371
The practice of the primitive Christians, noticed ..... ibid
Mosheim's Authority, noticed 372
John XX. 31, quoted 373
Authority of Locke and Newton, noticed ..... ibid
The term "Antichrist," examined 377
The Doctrine of Polytheism is similar to that of a plurality of persons 378
The Author's expression of thanks to God for enjoying Civil and Religious Liberty 379

FINAL APPEAL.

CHAPTER I.

Introductory remarks.

NEARLY a month having elapsed after the publication of the fourth number of the quarterly series of the "Friend of India" before it happened to reach me, and other avocations and objects having subsequently engaged my attention, I have not till lately had leisure to examine the laborious essay on the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement at the conclusion of that Magazine offered in refutation of my second appeal to the Christian public. For the able and condensed view of the arguments in support of those doctrines which that publication presents I have to offer the reviewer my best thanks, though the benefit I have derived from their perusal is limited to a corroboration of my former sentiments. I must at the same time beg permission to notice a few unjust insinuations in some parts of his essay; but in so doing I trust no painful emotions, neither of that salutary kind alluded to by the Editor,

nor of any other will make their appearance in my remarks.

The Revd. Editor charges me with the arrogance of taking upon myself "to teach doctrines directly opposed to those held by the mass of real Christians in every age." To vindicate myfelf from the presumption with which I am here charged, and to shew by what necessity I have been driven to the publication of opinions unacceptable to many esteemed characters, I beg to call the attention of the public to the language of the introduction to the "Precepts of Jesus" compiled by me and which was my first publication connected with Christianity. They may observe therein that so far from teaching any "opposite doctrines" or "rejecting the prevailing opinion held by the great body of Christians," I took every precaution against giving the least offence to the prejudices of any one, and consequently limited my labour to what I supposed best calculated for the improvement of those whose received opinions are widely different from those of Christians. My words are "I decline entering into any discussion on those points (the dogmas of Christianity) and confine my attention at present to the task of laying before my fellow creatures the words of Christ, with a translation

from the English into Sungscrit and the language of Bengal. I feel persuaded that by separating from the other matters contained in the new Testament the moral precepts found in that book, these will be likely to produce the desirable effects of improving the hearts and minds of men of different persuasions and degrees of understanding." (Introduction page 3). The Precepts of Jesus which I was desirous of teaching were not I hoped "opposed to the doctrines held by the mass of real Christians," nor did my language in the introduction imply the "rejection of those truths which the great body of the learned and pious have concurred in deeming fully contained in the sacred scriptures"

Notwithstanding all this precaution however I could not evade the reproach and censure of the Editor who not only expressed in "the Friend of India" No. 20 his extreme disapprobation of the compilation in a manner calculated more to provoke than lead to search after truth, but also indulged himself in calling me an injurer of the cause of truth. Disappointed as I was, I took refuge in the liberal protection of the public by appealing to them against the unexpected attacks of the Editor. In that appeal I carefully avoided enter-

ing into any discussion as to the doctrines held up as the fundamental principles of Christianity by the Editor. The language of my first appeal is this " Humble as he (the compiler) is he has therefore adopted those measures which he thought most judicious to spreadthe truth in an acceptable manner; but I am sorry to observe that he (the compiler) has unfortunately and unexpectedly met with opposition from those whom he considered the last persons likely to oppose him on this subject" Page 22. " Whether or not he (the compiler) has erred in his judgement, that point must be determined by those who will candidly peruse and consider the arguments already advanced on this subject bearing in mind the lesson particularly taught by the saviour himself of adapting his instructions to the susceptibility and capacity of his hearers, John XVI 12 " I have yet many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now" Page 24. " What benefit or peace of mind can we bestow upon a Mussulman who is an entire stranger to the Christian word, by communicating to him, without preparatory instruction, all the peculiar dogmas of Christianity" (Page 24). " The compiler obviously having in view at least one object in common with the Reviewer and Editor, that of procuring respect for the precepts of Christ might

have reasonably expected more charity from professed teachers of his doctrine" (Page 5) In reviewing the first appeal the Revd. Editor fully introduced the doctrines of the Godhead of Jesus and the Holy Ghost, and of the Atonement, as the only foundation of Christianity; whereby he compelled me, as a professed believer of one God, to deny for the first time publickly those doctrines; and now he takes occasion to accuse me of presumption in teaching doctrines which he has himself compelled me to avow.

The Editor assigns as a reason for entering on this controversy that after a review of the "Precepts of Jesus and the first appeal" he "felt some doubt whether their author fully believed the deity of Christ" and consequently he "adduced a few passages from the scriptures to confirm this doctrine." He then adds that this second appeal to the Christian public confirms all that he before only feared. (Page 1) I could have scarcely credited this assertion of the Reviewer's unacquaintance with my religious opinions, if the allegation had come from any other quarter; for both in my conversation and correspondence with as many Missionary gentlemen old and young as I have had the honour to know, I have never hesitated, when

required, to offer my sentiments candidly, as to the unscripturality and unreasonableness of the doctrine of the Trinity. On one occasion particularly when on a visit to one of the Revd. colleagues of the Editor at Serampore long before the time of these publications, I discussed the subject with that gentleman at his invitation; and then fully manifested my disbelief of this doctrine, taking the liberty of examining successively all the arguments he from friendly motives urged upon me in support of it Notwithstanding these circumstances, I am inclined to believe from my confidence in the character of the Editor, that either those Missionary gentlemen that were acquainted with my religious sentiments have happened to omit the mention of them to him, or he has forgotten what they had communicated on this subject, when he entered on the review of my publications on Christianity.

In Page 503 the Editor insinuates that vanity has led me to presume that "freedom from the powerful effects of early religious impressions" has enabled me to discover the truths of Scripture in its most important doctrines more fully in three or four years than others have done by most unremitting study in thirty or forty." The doctrine of the Trinity ap-

pears to me so obviously unscriptural that I am pretty sure, from my own experience and that of others, that no one possessed of merely common sense will fail to find its unscripturality after a methodical study of the Old and New Testaments, unless previously impressed in the early part of his life with creeds and forms of speech preparing the way to that doctrine. No pride therefore can be supposed for a moment to have arisen from commonly attainable success. The Editor might be fully convinced of this fact, were he to engage a few independent and diligent natives to study attentively both the Old and New Testaments in their original languages, and then to offer their sentiments as to the doctrine of the Trinity being scriptural or a mere human invention.

To hold up to ridicule my suggestions in the second appeal to study first the books of the Old Testament unbiassed by ecclesiastic opinions imbibed in early life, and then to study the New Testament, the Revd. Editor states that "could it be relied on indeed" my compendious method "would deserve notice with a view to Christian education; as" on my plan, "the most certain way of enabling any one to discover in a superior manner the truths and doctrines of Christianity is

to leave him till the age of thirty or forty without any religious impression." (Page 503) I do not in the least wonder at his disapprobation of my suggestion; as the Editor, in common with other professors of traditional opinions, is sure of supporters of his favorite doctine so long as it is inculcated on the minds of youths and even infants; who, being once thoroughly impressed with the name of the Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity, long before they can think for themselves, must be always inclined, even after their reason has become matured, to interpret the scared books, even those texts which are evidently inconsistent with this doctrine, in a manner favourable to their prepossessed opinion, whether their study be continued for three, or thirty, or twice thirty years. Could Hindooism continue after the present generation, or bear the studious examination of a single year, if the belief of their idols being endued with animation were not carefully impressed on the young before they come to years of understanding?

Let me here suggest that in my humble opinion no truly liberal and wise parent can ever take advantage of the unsuspecting and confiding credulity of his children to impress

them with an implicit belief in any set of abstruse doctrines, and intolerance of all other opinions, the truth or reasonableness of which they are incapable of estimating. Still less would he urge by threats the danger of present and eternal punishment for withholding a blind assent to opinions they are unable to comprehend. Parents are bound by every moral tie to give their children such an education as may be sufficient to render them capable of exercising their reason as rational and social beings, and of forming their opinion on religious points without illwill towards others, from a thorough investigation of the Scriptures and of the evidence and arguments adduced by teachers of different persuasions. Judgments thus formed have a real claim to respect from those who have not the means of judging for themselves. But of what consequence is it, in a question of truth or error, to know how the matter at issue has been considered, even for a hundred generations, by those who have blindly adopted the creed of their fathers? Surely the unbiassed judgment of a person who has proceeded to the study of the Sacred Scriptures with an anxious desire to discover the truth they contain, even if his researches were to be continued but for a single twelvemonth, ought as far as authority goes

in such matters, to outweigh the opinions of any number who have either not thought at all for themselves or have studied after prejudice had laid hold of their minds. What fair enquiry respecting the doctrine of the Trinity can be expected from one who has been on the bosom of his mother constantly taught to ask the blessing of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and to hear the very name of Unitarian with horror? Have the doctrines of the Vedant ever succeeded in suppressing polytheism amongst the generality of Hindoos brought up with the notion of the Godhead of the sun, of fire, and of water, and of the separate and independent existence of the allegorical representations of the attributes of God? Were the sublime works written by the learned among the Greeks ever able to shake the early acquired superstitious notions and polytheistical faith of the generality of their countrymen? Nay even when Christian converts became numerous, did not those who were brought up in the ancient superstition introduce some vestiges of their idolatry into their new persuasion? In fact nothing can more surely impede the progress of truth than prejudice instilled into minds blank to receive impressions, and the more unreasonable are the doctrines of a religion, the greater pains are

taken by the supporters of them to plant them in the readily susceptible minds of youth.

The Editor has filled a complete page in proving that besides early impressed prejudices there are also other causes of error in judgment—an attempt which might have been dispensed with; for, I never limited the sources of mistake in examining religious matters to early impression alone. I attributed only the prevailing errors in Christianity to traditional instructions inculcated in childhood as the language of my second appeal will shew. "Having derived my own opinions on this subject entirely from the scriptures themselves, I may perhaps be excused for the confidence with which I maintain them against those of so great a majority, who appeal to the same authority for their's; in as much as I attribute their different views, not to any inferiority of judgment compared with my own limited ability, but to the powerful effects of early religious impressions; for when these are deep, reason is seldom allowed its natural scope in examining them to the bottom" (Page 160) If the Editor doubt the accuracy of this remark, he might soon satisfy himself of its justice, were he to listen to the suggestion offered in the preceding paragraph with a view to ascertain whether the

doctrine of the Trinity rests for its belief on Scriptural authorities or on early religious impressions.

The Editor mentions ironically (in Page 3) tha my success in scriptural studies was such "as to prove that the most learned and pious in every age of the church have been so completely mistaken as to transform the pure religion of Jesus into the most horrible idolatry." In answer to this, I only beg to ask the Revd. Editor to let me know first what a Protestant in the fifteenth century could have answered, if he had been thus questioned by a Roman Catholic "Is your success in examining the truths of scripture such as to prove that the most learned and pious in every age of the church have been so completely mistaken as to transform the pure religion of Jesus into the most horrible idolatry by introducing the worship of Mary the mother of God, and instituting images in churches, as well as by acknowledging the Pope as the head of the church vested with the power of forgiving sins?" Would not his answer be this "My success is indeed so as to prove these doctrines to be unscriptural. As to your inferences they are no more divine than mine and though I do not doubt the piety and learning of many Christians of your church in every

age, I am persuaded that many corruptions, introduced into the Christian religion by the Roman heathens converted in the fourth and fifth centuries, have been handed down through successive generations by impressions made in the early part of life, and have taken such root in the minds of men that piety and learning have fallen short of eradicating prejudices nourished by church and state, as well as by the vulgar superstition and enthusiasm." Were this reply justifiable, I also might be allowed to offer the following answer: "I find not the doctrine of the Trinity in the scriptures; I cannot receive any human creed for divine truth; but without charging the supporters of this doctrine with impiety or fraud humbly attribute their misinterpretation of the scriptures to "early religious impressions."

The Editor assigns as a reason for his omission of several arguments adduced in the Second Appeal that "we have before us a work of a hundred and seventy-three pages, to an examination of which we can scarcely devote half that number: and while to leave a single page unnoticed, might by some be deemed equivalent to leaving it unanswered, the mere transcription of the passages to be answered, were it done in every instance, would

occupy nearly all the room we can give the reply itself. We shall therefore adduce such evidence for these doctrines, as if sound, will render every thing urged against them nugatory though not particularly noticed." To enable the public to compare the extent of the second appeal with that of the review, I beg to observe that the former contains 173 widely printed and the latter 128 closely printed pages, and that if any one will take the trouble of comparing the number of words per page in the two Essays he will soon satisfy himself that the one is as long as the other. I will afterwards notice in the course of the present reply whether or not "the evidence of these doctrines" adduced by the Editor in the Review has still left a great many arguments in the Appeal quite unanswered.

In his attempt to prove the insufficiency of the precepts of Jesus to procure men peace and happiness, the Revd. Editor advanced the following position "that the most excellent precepts, the most perfect law can never lead to happiness and peace unless by causing men to take refuge in the doctrine of the cross" (No. 1 Quarterly Series of the Friend of India page 111), without adducing any arguments having reference to the position. I therefore

brought to his recollection (in my First and Second Appeals) such authorities of the gracious author of Christianity as I conceived established the sufficiency of these precepts for leading to comfort, and solicited the Editor "to point out in order to establish his position, even a single passage pronounced by Jesus, enjoining refuge in the doctrine of the cross as all-sufficient or indispensable for salvation." (page 9 of the Second Appeal) The Editor instead of endeavouring to demonstrate the truth of his assertion as to the insufficiency of the precepts to conduct men to happiness, or shewing a single passage of the nature applied for, introduces a great number of other passages of scripture which he thinks well calculated to prove that the death of Jesus was an atonement for the sins of mankind. I regret that the Editor should have adopted such an irregular mode of arguing in solemn religious discussion; and I still more regret to find that some readers should overlook the want of connection between the position advanced and the authorities adduced by the Editor. Were we both to adopt such a mode of controversy as to cite passages apparently favourable to our respective opinions without adhering to the main ground, the number of his Reviews and of my Appeals

would increase at least in proportion to the number of the years of our lives; for verses and quotations of scripture, if unconnected with their context and interpreted without regard to the idiom of the languages in which they were written, may, as experience has shewn, be adduced to support any doctrine whatever: and the Editor may always find a majority of readers of the same religious sentiments with himself, satisfied with any thing that he may offer either in behalf of the Trinity or in support of the atonement.

Whether Jesus died actually as a sacrifice for the sins of men, or merely in the fulfilment of the duties of his office as the Messiah, as it was predicted, is merely a matter of opinion, the truth of which can only be ascertained from a diligent examination of the terms used and doctrines set forth in the evangelical writings. This however has no relation to a proof or disproof of the sufficiency of his precepts for salvation. In order to come to a conclusion as to the value of the precepts of Jesus being either really effectual or merely nominal, I deem it necessary to repeat a few passages already quoted in my Appeals, to ask the Editor whether they demand explicit belief or are unworthy of credit, and in case he

admit the former alternative, I should beg to ask him whether they confirm the opinion that the precepts preached by Jesus are sufficient to lead men to eternal peace and happiness, or are a set of sentences delivered by him conformably to the principles of his hearers, similar to other codes of moral law written by the ancient philosophers of Greece, Egypt, and India. The passages in question are as follow.

Mark XII. 29. Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like unto it, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandments greater than these." Is there another commandment absolutely enjoining refuge in the doctrine of the cross so as to shew that these two commandments are insufficient for salvation and comparatively insignificant?

Matthew VII. 24. "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine (alluding to the precepts contained in Ch. V, VI, and VII) and doth them, I will liken him unto a wise man who

built his house upon a rock &c." Are not these sayings declared by Jesus to afford a stable foundation on which may be raised the indestructible edifice of eternal life? John XV. 10. "If ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love." 14 "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." I therefore again ask the Revd. Editor to shew a commandment of Jesus directing refuge in the doctrine of the cross in the same explicit way as he has enjoined love to God and to neighbours, and obedience to his precepts as sufficient means for attaining eternal happiness. Did not Jesus in Matthew XXV. 31. et seq. by means of a parable in the description of the day of judgement, declare that acts of charity and beneficence toward fellow creatures will be accepted as the manifestation of love towards God, and be the sufficient cause of eternal life?

With a view to depreciate the weight of the following explicit promise of Jesus, "Do this and thou shalt live," the Editor interprets (509) that "Jesus taking him (the lawyer) on his own principles, as though he had been what he vainly imagined himself a sinless man who needed no saviour, directed him to the whole of the divine law adding, This do and thou shalt live," though he knew that it was utterly impos-

sible for that lawyer to observe his instructions. The Editor however quite forgot that by his attempt to undervalue the precepts of Jesus, he was actually degrading the dignity of the author of them; for according to his interpretation it appears that as the lawyer tempted Jesus by putting to him a question which he thought the saviour could not answer; so Jesus, in return, tempted him by directing him to do what he knew to be impossible for man to perform, though this very teacher forbids others to shew revenge even to enemies. Did Jesus take also the scribe "upon his own principles" by instructing him in these two commandments,*—a man who was never inclined to tempt Jesus, but "having heard him reasoning, and perceiving that he had answered well, asked him which is the first commandment of all"†; and when he heard the reply of Jesus he said "well, master thou hast said the truth,"—A man whom Jesus declared to be at least out of danger of hell from his acknowledgement of the truth of his precepts as the means of salvation telling him "*thou art not far from the kingdom of heaven?*" Did Jesus on the mount take also his disciples "upon their own principle" as though they had been what they vainly imagined, themselves sinless men who needed no saviour,

* Mark XII 29. † Mark XII. 28–34.

in directing them to his precepts, the observance of which he knew utterly impossible; and in holding out promises* of eternal salvation as the necessary consequence of their obedience to those sayings.—Were we to follow the mode of interpretation adopted in this instance by the Editor, the Bible would serve only to suit our convenience, and would not be esteemed any longer as a guide to mankind; for according to the same mode of interpretation would it not be justifiable to explain Matthew XXVIII. 19. "go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them" &c. that Jesus took his apostles "upon their own principle" as firmly persuaded to believe in the sanctification attainable by the baptism introduced by John the Baptist, although he was aware that immersion in water could produce no effect in changing the state of the heart?

In reply to his question "did Jesus who knew the hearts of all, regard this lawyer as perfectly sinless, an exception to all mankind" (page 9) I must say that the context seems to me to shew that neither Jesus considered the lawyer to be a sinless perfect man (as is evident from his directing him to the scriptures

* Mathew VII. 24 and 25.

for a guide to salvation ("Do this and thou shalt live"; and "Go and do thou likewise.") Nor did the lawyer vainly imagine himself a sinless man who needed no saviour, though he endeavoured to put the claim of Jesus to that title to the proof in these words "Master what shall I do to inherit eternal life?"

Although I declared (in the Second Appeal page 6) that by the term "law" in the verse "If righteousness came by the law, Christ is dead in vain": all the commandments found in the books of Moses are understood; yet the Revd. Editor charges me with an unintelligible expression, and intimates his inability to ascertain whether I meant by law the ceremonial or the moral part of the books of Moses (page 507). I therefore beg to explain the verse more fully that the Revd. Editor may have an opportunity of commenting upon it at large. St. Paul, knowing the efficacy of the perfection introduced by Jesus into the law given by Moses, declares that had the system of the Mosaical law been sufficient to produce light among the Jews and Gentiles, without being perfected by Jesus, this attempt made by Christ to perfect it would have been superfluous, and his death, which was the consequence of his candid instructions, would have been to no purpose.

The Editor notices frequently my expression of the neglect of duty on the part of man to the Creator and to his fellow creatures, nevertheless he fills up more than two pages in proving this point. He has not however attempted to counteract the force of the passages I quoted in both of my Appeals, shewing that the guilt occasioned by the want of due obedience to the precepts in question may be pardoned through repentance prescribed by the author of those precepts as the sure and only remedy for human failure. I therefore beg to ask the Editor to give a plain explanation of the following passages selected from my Appeals, that the reader may be able to judge whether or not repentance can procure us the blessings of pardon for our constant omissions in the discharge of the duties laid down in the precepts of Jesus. Luke V. 32. "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Does not Jesus here declare a chief object of his mission to be the calling of sinners to repentance? Luke XXIV. 47. "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." Did not Jesus by this commandment to his disciples declare the remission of sins as an immediate and necessary consequence of repentance? In Luke XIII. 3. "Except you repent you shall all

likewise perish," the indispensibility of repentance for the forgiveness of sins is explicitly declared.—Is not also the mercy of God illustrated by the example of a father forgiving the transgressions of his son through his sincere repentance alone, in the parable of the prodigal son? Those who place confidence in the divine mission of Jesus, or even in his veracity, will not hesitate, I trust, for a moment to admit that Jesus has directed us to sincere repentance as the only means of procuring pardon, knowing the inability of men to give entire obedience to his precepts; and that Jesus would have recommended the lawyer, whom he directed to righteousness, to have recourse to repentance "had he gone and sincerely attempted" to obey his precepts, "watching his own heart to discern those constant neglects of the duty he owed to the Creator and to his fellow creatures," and then applied to Jesus for the remedy of his discerned imperfections.

I find abundant passages in the Old Testament also representing other sources than sacrifice as sufficient means of procuring pardon for sin. Psalm LI. 17. "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Ezekiel XVIII. 30. "Repent and return yourselves from all your

transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin." Proverb XVI. 6. "By mercy and truth iniquity is purged, and by the fear of the Lord men depart from evil." Isaiah I. 18. "Come now and let us reason together saith the Lord. Though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson they shall be as wool."

To shew the inefficacy of repentance to procure pardon the Editor appeals to human justice, which, as he says, "inquires not about the repentance of the robber and murderer; but respecting his guilt. The law indeed knows no repentance.' (506) I therefore wish to know whether or not human justice suffers an innocent man to be killed to atone for the guilt of theft or murder committed by another. It is at all events more consistent with justice that a judge who has the privilege of shewing mercy should forgive the crimes of those that truly feel the pain and distress of mind inseparable from sincere repentance, than that he should put an innocent man to death or destroy his own life to atone for the guilt of some of his condemned culprits.

CHAPTER II.

Inquiry into the doctrine of the atonement.

In his first Review, the Editor began with what he considered "the most abstruse and yet the most important of Christian doctrines, the deity of Jesus Christ" and then proceeded to substantiate the doctrine of his atonement; I therefore followed this course of arrangement in my Second Appeal; but as the Editor has introduced the doctrine of the atonement of Jesus first in the present Review, I will also arrange my reply accordingly.

The Editor quotes first Genesis III. 15. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel."—From this passage he attempts to deduce the atonement of Jesus for the sins of men, demanding "what could a reptile feel relative to the fate of its offspring through future ages? of what individual serpents did the seed of the woman break the head so as for it to bruise his heel?"—"Je-

sus then," he affirms "is the seed of the woman who suffered from the malice of Satan, while he on the cross, destroyed his power by atoning for sin and reconciling man to God." (page 517) I admit that a reptile as far as human experience goes is incapable of feeling "relative to the fate of its offspring through future ages;" but I wish to know if a mere reptile could not have the power of conversation so as to persuade a woman to adhere to its advice; whether the ass of Balaam could be possessed of the power of seeing exclusively the angel of God and conversing with its own master Balaam? and whether ravens could diligently supply the wants of Elijah by bringing him bread and flesh morning and evening? Are not these occurrences equally difficult to reconcile to "common sense" as the case of the serpent is according to the Editor? Yet we find these stated in the sacred books, and we are taught to believe them as they stand. Can we justly attempt to represent the ass and those ravens also as either angelical or demoniacal spirits, in the same way as the reptile is represented by the Editor to have been no other than Satan? We might in that case be permitted to give still greater latitude to metaphor, so as to take all the facts found in the Bible as merely allegorical representations; but

would not the consequence of such interpretations be most dangerous to the cause of truth? The verse in question with its context thus runs, "And the Lord God said unto the serpent; because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above* all cattle and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: and I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." Do not the phrases "thou art cursed above *all cattle*" and "above *every beast* of the field," shew clearly that the serpent thus addressed was really no spirit in borrowed form, but the animal so denominated? Does not the circumstance of the serpent being condemned to move upon its belly and to eat dust all the days of its life, evidently imply that the serpent thus cursed was of the same class that we now see subject to that very malediction to the present day? The sins of fathers are declared in the scriptures to have been visited by God on their posterity; would it not be therefore more consistent with scriptural authorities to attribute the misery of serpents to the heinous conduct of their first origin, than to Satan, of whom no

* מכל Composed of two words מן and כל i. e. *out of all.*

mention is made throughout the chapter in question?

But in fact has the power of Satan over the seed of the woman been destroyed? The consequences of the sin which our first parents committed by the ill advice of the reptile, and which they implanted in the nature of their posterity, have been that women bring forth children in sorrow, and are ruled by their husbands, and that the earth brings forth thorns also, and thistles to men who eat the herb of the field with labour and return at last to dust (Genesis III. 16—19) If Jesus actually atoned for sin and delivered men from its consequences; how can those men and women who believe in his atonement be still, equally with others, liable to the evil effects of the sins already remitted by the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus?

If notwithstanding all the above stated facts and arguments the Editor still insists that Satan should be understood by the reptile mentioned in the verse, and Jesus by the seed of the woman, yet his interpretation can not apply in the least to the doctrine of the atonement. It would imply only that as Satan opposed the power of Jesus to procure salvation for all men as he

intended, so Jesus diminished his power, and disappointed him by leading many to salvation through his divine precepts. I know not how to answer the question of the Editor " of what individual serpent did the seed of the woman break the head so as for it to bruise his heel?" unless by referring him to the reciprocal injuries which man and serpents inflict on each other.

The Editor refers to the circumstance of the sacrifice offered by Abel and approved of God in preference to his brother Cain's, (Genesis IV. 4) esteeming it as an illustration of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus for the remission of sin(page 518). But I am unable to find out what relation there could exist between the acceptance of the offering of Abel by Jehovah, and the death of Jesus, whether sacrificial or not. The Editor, however, founds his assertion that Abel having looked forward to the atonement of Jesus, his offerings were accepted by God, upon the circumstance of Abraham's seeing the day of Christ by prophetic anticipation (John VIII. 56.); and of Moses having esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the trea-

sures in Egypt, (Heb. XI. * 26) they all having been "of the same catalogue." I therefore should hope to be informed whether there be any authority justifiying this inference. On the contrary we find verse fourth of the same chapter of Genesis points out that Abel having been accustomed to do well in obedience to the will of God, contrary to the practice of his brother, righteous Jehovah accepted his offering and rejected that of Cain: to which Paul thus alludes, "By faith Abel offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain" (Hebrew XI. 4.); without leaving us doubtful as to the sense in which that apostle used the word "faith" in the above verse.

"By faith Abel offered unto God &c." "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death &c." "But without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that *cometh to God* must believe that *he is* and that he is a *rewarder of them* who diligently seek him." Here St. Paul gives us to understand that the

* (Improved version of the new Testament) Gr. "the reproach of Christ," or, "of the anointed." The Israelites are called Christs, or anointed, i. e. a chosen and favoured people, Psalm CV. 15. Heb. III 13. "The meaning is," says Dr. Sykes in loc., "that Moses looked upon the contempt and indignity which he underwent on account of his professing himself a Jew, as much preferable to all the riches and honours of Egypt." See also Whitby in loc. Dr. Newcome's version is, "such reproach as Christ endured," which is also the interpretation of Photius, Crellius, and Mr. Lindsey, Sequel, page 278.

"faith" which procured for Abel, Enoch, Noah, and all the other Patriarchs, the grace of God, was their belief in the *existence* of God and in his being their *rewarder*, and not in any sacrifice personal or vicarious. What could prophetic anticipation by Abraham of the divine commission of Jesus have to do with Abel's conduct in rendering his sacrifices acceptable to God, that any one can esteem the one as the necessary consequence of the other? Moses having called himself a Jew gave preference to the term "anointed" or "Israelite", a term of reproach among the Egyptians in those days, over all the riches and honour of Egypt which he might have obtained by declaring himself an Egyptian instead of a Jew; or Moses esteemed (according to the English version) in his prophetic power the reproach to which Christ would be made liable by the Jews in the fulfilment of his divine commission, greater riches than all the grandeur of Egyptian unbelievers. But neither explanation can support the idea that Abel, or any other Patriarch, had in view the sacrificial death of Jesus in rendering their offering acceptable to God.

It is true as the Editor observes that sacrifices are divine institutions as a manifestation of obedience to God through the oblation of

any thing that may be dear to man, whether common as an animal, or dearly valuable as one's own son. But they are not represented in any of the sacred books as means having intrinsically the power of procuring men pardon and eternal salvation. They seem, in fact, intended for men unaccustomed to the worship of God in truth and spirit. The following passages suffice to illustrate this beyond doubt: Micah VI. 7 and 8. "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first born for my transgression; the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee O man what is good, and what doth the Lord *require* of thee *but to do justly* and *to love mercy* and *to walk humbly* with thy God?" Here Jehovah while shewing his displeasure at mere animal sacrifices, enjoins just actions and humility in lieu of them as worthy to be accepted by God, without substituting human sacrifices in their stead. Hosea VI. 6. "For I desired mercy *and not sacrifice* and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings." Isaiah 1—11. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts and I delight not in the blood of bullocks or of lambs or of he-goats"

"Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord. though your sins be as scarlet they shall be *as white as snow* &c." Does not Jehovah here substitute good works alone for sacrifices as real means of taking away sins? Psalm L. 8. "I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices or thy burnt offerings, to have been continually before me. I will take no bullock out of thy house nor he-goats out of thy folds. For every beast of the forest is mine and the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls of the mountains and the wild beasts of the field are mine. If I were hungry I would not tell thee; for the world is mine and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thanksgiving; and pay thy vows unto the most High; and call upon me in the day of trouble I will deliver thee and thou shalt glorify me." Jehovah who protests against the idea of the flesh of bulls being supposed his food and the blood of goats his drink can not be supposed

to have had delight in human blood, the blood of his beloved son. Samuel XV. 22. "And Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." Proverb XXI. 3. "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice" Ecclesiastes V. 1. "Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God; and be more ready to hear than to give the *sacrifice of fools.* For they consider not that they *do evil.*"

It is now left for us to ascertain in what sense we should take such phrases as "This man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins." "Christ hath once appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate" "I am the living bread." "If any man eat of this" &c. Whether do these passages imply that Jesus though he preferred mercy to sacrifice (Mathew IX. 13. XII. 7.) did actually sacrifice himself and offer hs own blood to God as an atonement for the sins of others, or do they mean that Jesus knowing already that the fulfilment of his divine commission would endanger his life, never hesitated to execute it and suffered his blood to be shed

in saving men from sin through his divine precepts and pure example, which were both opposed to the religious system adopted by his cotemporary Jews? Were we to follow the former mode of interpretation and take all these phrases in their strictly literal sense, we must be persuaded to believe that God not being contented with the blood of bulls and goats and other animal sacrifices offered to him by the Israelites, insisted upon the offer of the blood and life of his son as the condition of his forgiving the sins of men; and that Jesus accordingly offered his blood to propitiate God, and also proposed to men actually to eat his flesh! Would not the doctrines of Christianity in this case representing God as delighted with human victims and directing men to cannibalism appear monstrous to every civilised being? No one unless biassed by prejudices can justify such inconsistency as to interpret literally some of the above-mentioned phrases in support of the doctrine of the atonement, and explain the last quoted figuratively, as they are all confessedly alike subversive of every rational idea of the nature of the divine justice and mercy.

To avoid such a stigma upon the pure religion of Jesus, it is incumbent I think upon us to

follow the latter mode of interpretation, and to understand from the passages referred to, that Jesus, the spiritual Lord and King of Jews and Gentiles, in fulfilment of the duties of his mission, exposed his own life for the benefit of his subjects, purged their sins by his doctrines, and persevered in executing the commands of God even to the undergoing of bodily suffering in the miserable death of the cross; a self devotion or sacrifice of which no Jewish high priest had ever offered an example.

Ought not this belief in the unbounded beneficence of Jesus to excite superior gratitude, love, and reverence towards our Saviour and King than the idea that he, as God above mortal afflictions, borrowed human nature for a season, and offered this fictitious man as a sacrifice for the remission of sin, while he himself was no more afflicted with that sacrificial death than with the sufferings of other human individuals. If there be in this latter case any gratitude felt for the afflictions which attached to the death of the cross, it should be manifested to that temporary man Jesus, and not to Jesus the Christ, whom the Editor and other Trinitarians esteem as God above pain and death.

If it be urged that it is inconsistent with common justice to pardon sin that requires the capital punishment of death without an atonement for it, it may be replied that the perfection of divine justice, as well as other attributes of God, should not be measured by what are found in, and adopted by, the human race. Is it consistent with our common notions of justice to visit the sins of fathers on their descendants as God ascribed to himself? (Exodus XX. 5.) Is it consistent with our common notions of justice to afflict men with infinite punishment for their finite guilt as Jesus declares in Matthew XVIII. 8.? Even in the present case would it be consistent with common notions of justice to afflict an innocent man with the death of the cross for sins committed by others even supposing the innocent man should voluntarily offer his life in behalf of those others? We can have no idea of the perfection of divine justice, mercy, and wrath unless from what is revealed to us; and as we find in the sacred books that sins have been pardoned in consequence of the intercession of righteous men without any sacrificial atonement, we should therefore be contented with those authorities and should not entertain doubt as to pardon being bestowed upon those who have had the advantage of the intercession of Je-

sus, exalted as he was by God over all prophets and righteous men that ever lived.

Number XIV. 19—20. Moses prayed to the Lord "Pardon I beseech thee the iniquity of this people according unto the greatness of thy mercy and as thou hast forgiven this people from Egypt even until now; and the Lord said I have pardoned *according to thy word.*" 2 Chrono XXX. 18. 19. and 20. "For a multitude of the people, even many of Ephraim and Mannasseh, Issachar and Zebulun, had not cleansed themselves, yet did they eat the passover otherwise than it was written. But Hezekiah prayed for them saying, The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary. And the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah, and healed the people." Psalm CVI. 23. "therefore he said that he would destroy them, had not Moses his chosen stood before him in the breach to turn away his wrath, lest he should destroy." Did not Jehovah here forgive the sins of Israel from the intercession of Moses without having the least reference to the offer of animal or human blood? Psalm XXXII. 5. "I acknowledged my sin unto thee and mine iniquity have

I not hid; I said I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord and thou *forgavest* the iniquity of my sin." Were not sins forgiven in this instance also through confession and humility without blood offerings? Psalm CXIII. 2. Let *my prayer be set forth* before thee as incense; and the *lifting up of my hands* as the evening sacrifice" Isaiah LV. 7. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him: and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." Jeremiah VII. 21. 23. "Thus saith the Lord of hosts the God of Israel, Put your *burnt offerings unto your sacrifices and eat flesh* for I spake not unto your fathers nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt; concerning *burnt offerings* or sacrifices. But this thing commanded I them saying *obey* my *voice* and I will be your God and ye shall be my people &c." Here we find prayers and obedience preferred to animal sacrifices as means of pardon and no reference direct or figurative to propitiation to be made by human blood: Such an attempt therefore as to represent human blood or that of God in human form in lieu of animal blood as an indispensable atonement for sins, is, I think, unscriptural.

The Editor quotes (page 519.) Heb. X. "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins; sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not but a body hast thou prepared me; in burnt offerings and sacrifices thou hast had no pleasure" And he attempts thereby to prove that "sacrifices considered in themselves then, were never desired by God, they are approved merely with a view to his making atonement for whom God had prepared a body" and that "they ceased after he had offered himself a sacrifice for sin." How strange is the idea that "God who preserves man and beast nor suffers a sparrow to fall to the ground without his permission" and by whom sacrifices "were never desired for their own sake" should have caused millions of animals to be slaughtered at different times by men under the mistaken notion of their being an atonement for sins while he has been remitting iniquity from eternity referring only to the real and sufficient atonement made by Jesus for the sins of all men that ever lived from the beginning of the world?

How inconsistent is such an idea with the known mercy of that Providence whose unwillingness to receive human sacrifices was such that when Abraham had proved his fide-

lity by binding his son on the altar, God stayed his hand from the sacrifice and produced a ram unexpectedly before him which he was graciously pleased to accept as an offering in *the stead of Isaac* (Genesis XXII. 13.) How can we imagine that God should have received the offering which he himself had thus prepared, with reference solely to the future sacrifice of a being far superior in excellence to Isaac whose life he mercifully preserved ?

As to the above cited verses, they rather corroborate the second mode of interpretation noticed in the preceding paragraphs than the doctrine of a real human sacrifice in the Christian dispensation; for in verses fifth and sixth, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews declares the dissatisfaction of God with sacrifices and offerings in general terms without limiting them to any particular species whether of man or of animal. The language of the fifth verse "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me," confirms the idea that the divine disregard of mere sacrifice led to the preparation of a body for Jesus, through which he could impart to mankind the perfection of the will and laws of God in a manner consistent with the divine nature, teaching them to yield to God a heart-felt, instead of a

ceremonial and outward obedience, and thereby putting an end to the further effusion of blood as a testimony of humility, gratitude, and devotion.

Hence it appears more consistent with the context and the general tenour of scripture to understand by the phrase "The offering of the body of Jesus Christ" (quoted often by the Editor) the death of Jesus as a spiritual and virtual sacrifice for the sins of all those for whom he became a mediator; in as much as by that death the blessed saviour testified his perfect obedience and devotion to the will of his heavenly father, and thereby vindicated to himself the unlimited favour of God. During his life he instructed mankind how they might render themselves worthy of the divine mercy; by his death he qualified himself to be their intercessor at the heavenly throne, when sincere repentance was to be offered by them instead of perfect duty. We may easily account for the adoption by the apostles, with respect to him, of such terms as sacrifice and atonement for sin, and their representing Jesus as the high-priest engaged to take away the sins of the world by means of his blood. These were modes of speech made use of in allusion to the sacrifices

and blood-offerings which the Jews and their high-priest used to make for the remission of sins; and the apostles wisely accommodated their instructions to the ideas and forms of language familiar to those whom they addressed.

How inconsistent would it be in the author of the epistle to the Hebrews to declare in one place that God would not have sacrifice and offering; and again to announce, almost at the same moment, that he was so pleased with sacrifice, even with a human sacrifice, that for its sake he would forgive the sins of the world. Besides in the Christian dispensation sacrifice implies a spiritual offering required by God not only from the author of this religion, but also from his disciples and followers; a fact which may be illustrated by sacred authority. 1 Peter II. 4 and 5. "To whom coming as unto a *living stone* disallowed indeed of men but *chosen of God and precious*, ye also as *lively stones* are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up *spiritual sacrifices* acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

I am not at all disposed to dispute the assertion of the Editor (page 532), that "a priest without atonement however had no existence

in the old Testament" but I must say that a priest without atonement has existence in the new Testament, and refer the Editor to the following verses, excluding those that are applied to Jesus. Rev. I. 6. "And hath made us kings and priests unto God;" XX. 6. "but they shall be priests of God and of Christ and shall reign with him a thousand years; 1 Peter V. 5. "Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood." Moreover in explaining such phrases as "I am the living bread."—"If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever."—"The bread that I will give is my flesh." "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man" and "Unless ye eat his flesh and drink his blood, ye have no life in you"—"my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed"—protestant commentators take upon themselves to interpret that these phrases are in allusion to the manner of sacrifice, and that the eating of the flesh of Jesus and drinking his blood must be understood in a spiritual not in a carnal sense. If these writers make so direct an encroachment upon the literal sense of those phrases in order to avoid the idea of cannibalism being a tenet of Christianity, why should I not be justified upon the same principles and on the authority of the apostle in understanding by sacrifice

in the language of the apostle a virtual oblation; that Christianity may not be represented as a religion founded upon the horrible system of human victims.

The Editor first refers (page 520) to "Noah's sacrifice on his coming out of the ark;" whence he concludes that all the genuine religion of the new world was founded on the future atonement made by Christ. He again mentions God having made a promise to Abraham, that in him "shall all the families of the earth be blessed" a blessing which came to the Gentiles through Jesus. He considers this circumstance of the communication of blessing as fully foretelling the atonement of Jesus. The Editor has also quoted the passage in Job "I know that my redeemer liveth and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth;" being of opinion that the term redeemer being applied to Christ proves either his atonement or his deity. I must confess my inability to find out the connection between these authorities and the conclusion drawn by the Editor from them. Did God, who, according to the Revd. Editor, had no delight even in animal sacrifice, anticipate great delight in human sacrifice when Noah made an offering to him?

May we not admit, that the divine promise to Abraham has been fulfilled in the blessings we enjoy derived from the sacred instructions of Jesus, without assuming that other advantages have been reaped by us from the circumstance of his having shed his blood for us exclusively considered? If not, how can Jesus assure us of the divine blessing merely through the observance of his instructions? Matthew V. 3—11. Luke XI. 28. "But said he (Jesus) yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it,"

Could not Job or any one call another his redeemer or deliverer without having allusion to his blood? Cannot one being redeem another without sacrificing his own blood? How is it then we find Jehovah, the father of all, called redeemer, though in that capacity not considered even by Trinitarians to have had his blood shed as an atonement. Isaiah LXIII. 16. "Thou O, Lord art our father, our redeemer" LX. 16. "Shalt know that I Jehovah am thy saviour and thy redeemer."

I wonder at the assertion of the Editor that "the Messiah is not termed a redeemer merely on account of his teaching or his example: These" (he says) "could be of no value to Job who lived

so long before the appearance of Christ in the earth." I wish to know whether Job an inspired writer is to be considered as possessed of a knowledge of future events or not; as in the former case the circumstances of Christ's atoning for sin, according to the Editor, and the nature and import of his divine instructions were equally known to him, and he could call the Messiah redeemer in either view. In the latter case (i. e. if he was unacquainted with future events while writing this passage) then the doctrine of the atonement and the saving truths inculcated by Christ were, of course, equally hidden from him, and neither consequently could be of any value to Job, "who lived so long before Christ's appearance in the earth." The fact is the verse of Job quoted by the Editor has no such obvious reference to the Messiah that any one can be justified in applying to Jesus the term "redeemer" found in the same verse. I therefore quote it with it's context, that my readers may have a better opportunity of considering the subject in question. Job XIX. 24—26. "That they (my words) were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever! For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter

day* upon the earth. And though after my *skin worms destroy* this body, yet in my flesh shall *I see God.*"

The Editor having urged in his first review (page 101.) that the circumstance of the term "lamb" being twice applied to Jesus by John the Baptist, shewed that Jesus came into the world to sacrifice his life as an atonement for sin, I obssrved to the Editor in my Second Appeal (page 68) that such terms as "lamb" and "sheep" were applied in scripture to the disciples of Jesus also; many of whom likewise suffered death in their attempt to withdraw men from sin, yet in their cases no allusion to the sacrificial lamb has ever been made; and that it might be therefore safely inferred that the epithets "lamb" and "sheep" are merely figurative terms for innocence subjected to persecution. The Editor however without noticing this observation, quotes in his present review (page 522) some verses of the epistles of Peter and John, in which the apostles use the same epithet "lamb" applied to their gracious master. It is obvious from what I stated in my Second Appeal, that I did not dispute the application of that term to Jesus in the scriptural

* אחרון Signifies properly *afterwards* without any reference to a particular day.

books. I only maintained that no Christian, whether primitive or modern, could ever apply the word "lamb" in its literal sense to Jesus; who, as being above the angels of God, is of course far above the nature of a "lamb;" and that under this consideration it must have been used for innocence subjected to persecution, as we find the use of the word "lamb" very frequent elsewhere when applied to man; (John XXI. 15. already quoted in the Second Appeal) "feed my lambs" Luke X. 3. "Behold I send you forth as lambs among wolves." Genesis XXII. 7 and 8. "and he (Isaac) said, Behold the fire and the wood: but where is the lamb for a burntoffering? and Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burntoffering?" Wherein Abraham doubtless meant his innocent son about to be subjected to a violent death; hiding the commandment of God from him, as appears from the following verses;—"And they came to the place which God had told him of; and Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac his son and laid him on the altar upon the wood: and Abraham stretched forth his hand and took the knife to slay his son." Jeremiah XI. 19. "But I was like a lamb or an ox that is brought to slaughter."

Upon the same principle the apostles generally used "blood" for condescension to death; and "sacrifice" for a virtual one; as I noticed fully in the preceding paragraphs.

The Editor relates (page 524) that the priest used to lay his hands on the head of a living goat "and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, putting them on the head of the goat and by the hand of a fit person to send it away into the wilderness as *an atonement* for *all their sins* in every year." He then infers from this circumstance that "commandments like these did more than merely foretel the atonement of Christ." Were we to consider at all the annual scapegoat as an indication of some other atonement for sin, we must esteem it as a sign of Aaron's bearing the iniquities of Israel; both the scapegoat and Aaron having alike born the sins of others without sacrificing their lives: but by no means can it be supposed a sign of the atonement of Christ, who according to the author bore the sins of men by the sacrifice of his own life, and had therefore no resemblance to the scape Goat or Aaron: Exodus XXVIII. 38. "And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things which the children of Israel shall

hallow in all their holy gifts: and it shall be always upon his forehead that they may be accepted before the Lord." I wonder that the Revd. Editor himself notices here that the iniquities of Israel were forgiven by confession over the scape-goat, without animal or human victims, and yet represents the circumstance of the *scape*-goat as a prediction of the sacrificial *death* of Christ, and insists upon the forgiveness of sins being founded upon the effusion of blood.

The Revd. Editor now begins with Psalm II. 1. (page 527) stating that in Acts IV. the apostles lifted up "their voices with one accord to God in the very words of the Psalms, adding verse 27." "For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together;" Secondly he quotes Psalm XVI 8—11. comparing them with Acts II. 25—27; 3rdly Psalm XXII. 1. comparing it with Hebrews II. 10—12; 4thly Psalm XXXI. 5, while he repeats Psalm XL. 6—8, comparing them to Heb. X. 4; 5thly Psalm XLV. 6 and 7. comparingit with Heb. I. 8—12: 6thly Psalm LXVIII. 18. applying it to Ephesians IV. 8—11; 7thly Psalm LXIX. 1 and 2; comparing them

with John II. 17. "The zeal of thy house has eaten me up;" and with Romans XV. 3. "Even Christ pleased not himself; but as it is written, the reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me;" 8thly Psalms LXXII. 7—11. and 17; 9thly Psalms LXXXIX. 19—36 and 37; 10thly Psalms CII. 4—5 and 10, quoting immediately after this. Heb I. 7, without comparing one with the other; 11thly Psalm CXVIII. 22; 12thly Psalm CX. 1 and 4. After having filled up more than six pages (527—533) with the quotations of the above Psalms, the Editor observes that "notwithstanding the abundant evidence of the atonement and even the deity of Christ already adduced from the Pentateuch and the Psalms" &c. But I regret that none of these Psalms appear to me to bear the least reference to the principle of vicarious sacrifice as an atonement for sin except Psalm fourteenth; in which a declaration of the displeasure of Jehovah at sacrifice in general is made, and which I have fully examined in the preceding paragraphs. I therefore beg my readers to look over all the Psalms introduced here by the Editor, and to form their opinion whether these are properly applied to the discussion of the doctrine of the atonement; and should they find them having little or no relation to a proof of the atonement

they may then judge whether the frequent complaint of the Editor of *the want* of *room* is or is not well founded.

I will examine his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus from some of these Psalms in a subsequent chapter on the Trinity; but cannot omit to notice here two or three remarks made by the Editor, in the course of quoting these Psalms, on some of my assertions in the Second Appeal, leaving a decision on them to the free judgement of the public. The Editor having quoted Psalm XL. 6—8. and compared these verses with Hebrews X. 4—7. 9. thus concludes; (Page 528) "By these declarations various facts are established: They inform us that the grand design of the son in becoming man was that of being a sacrifice; which fully refutes our author's assertion (page 58.) that the sole object of his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions." The Editor, I am sorry to say, following a frequent practice of his other othodox brethren, omits the immediately following verses which thoroughly explain whether "the will of God" mentioned in verse eighth of the psalm quoted by the Editor implies sacrifice or divine instructions; "I delight to do thy will O my God: yea, thy *law* iswithin my heart. *I have*

preached righteousness in the *great congregation*: lo, I have not refrained my lips, O Lord, thou knowest. *I have not hid* thy righteousness within my heart. *I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation: I have not concealed thy loving kindness and thy truth* from the great congregation." It is now left to the public to judge whether psalm fortieth quoted by the Editor establishes that "the grand design of the son in becoming man was that of being a sacrifice," or of preaching the righteousness of God to the world, and declaring his truth and salvation to them. The preparing of the body for the son, as found in Hebrews X. 5 implies of course the necessity of his being furnished with a body in preaching the will of God to mortal men; a body which, in the fulfilment of his commission, Jesus never valued, but exposed to danger and virtually offered as a sacrifice.

It is worth observing that the Editor though he affirms positively, that the grand object of the son's appearing in this world was to be a sacrifice, and not to inculcate divine instructions; and thinks it proper to rest his position upon a comparsion of the above Psalm with Hebrews, yet never attempts to reconcile to this notion the verses pointed out in page 58 of my Second Appeal, proving that the object of

his mission was to preach and impart divine instructions. Are we to place greater reliance on his bare affirmation, or on the authority of Jesus himself the Lord and King of Jews and Gentiles?

Not finding a single assertion in the scriptures that can support his above notion, the Editor lays stress upon John X. 17. "Therefore doth my father love me because I lay down my life that I might take it again." Do these words imply any thing more than his attributing the love of the father towards the son to his implicit obedience even to the loss of his own life taken by the rebellious Jews? Should a General inform his fellow soldiers that his king is attached to him in consequence of his being ready to give up his life in the discharge of his duty, can we thence infer that the grand design of the king in appointing him General is his death, and not his reconciling rebels to their merciful king through friendly entreaty and offers of amnesty which we know he has employed?

The second conclusion of the Editor from the above quoted Psalms and Hebrews is that "they also demonstrate that the son delighted in offering himself a sacrifice, which refutes that

dreadful assertion that Jesus declared great aversion to the death of the cross and merely yielded to it as knowing that the will of his father rendered such death unavoidable." I find no mention made in Hebrews X. much less in Psalm XL. of the son's "delighting in offering himself as a sacrifice;' on the contrary it is evidently found in Hebrews X. that whatever the son performed with the body prepared him was entirely through his implicit obedience to the will of the father; verse. 7 "Then said I (the son) lo I come to do thy will O God" —"Then said he (the son) lo I come to do thy will O God."(9) an assertion which is thoroughly confirmed by what I quoted in my Second Appeal, pages 62 and 63, part of which I am necessitated to repeat here to shew that Jesus whether as man or God (let the Editor decide) declared great aversion to death yet yielded to it in common with many other prophets, knowing that the will of his father rendered such death unavoidable. Matthew XXVI. 37. 38. 39. and 42. "And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, My soul is *exceeding sorrowful even unto death.* And prayed, saying. O my father, if it be possible, let this cup (meaning death) pass from me, nevertheless *not as I will,* but as thou

wilt He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my father, if this cup may not pass away from me except I drink it, thy will be done." Mark XIV. 36. "And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; *take away this cup from me:* nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt" Luke XXII. 42 and 44. "Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground."

Now let the Editor find out a set of verses or even a single passage which may evince that Jesus so far from feeling aversion to death delighted in it, as he has attempted to prove; and let him take upon himself to reconcile such gross contradictions between those two sets of passages (if there are any such) or reject one set of them.

The third conclusion of the Editor from the above Psalm and the compared passage of Hebrews is that "they furnish a complete answer to the declaration (page 62) that it would be a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being who had all the human

feelings, and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross for the crimes committed by others, and (page 63) that the iniquity of one's being sentenced to death as an atonement for the fault committed by another, is such that every just man would shudder at the idea of ones being put to death for a crime committed by another, even if the innocent man should willingly offer his life in behalf of that other." The Editor then maintains that the texts quoted (Psalm and Hebrews) refute the above positions, stating that "this iniquity, if it be such, the father willed, since he prepared the son a body in which to suffer this palpable injustice." In this I perfectly coincide with the Editor, that the death of the innocent Jesus took place, like that of many preceding prophets, by the unsearchable will of God, who hath ordained that all the sons of men shall die, some by a violent and painful death, others by an easy and natural extinction: nor do I require the evidence of the text quoted, ("Thou hast prepared me a body,") to convince me of the fact declared by Jesus in his agony in the garden, that his sufferings in particular were, like those of mankind in general, conformable to the will of God. But I cannot find any thing in these words that warrants an inference so contrary to our ideas of justice as

that the pain thus suffered by Jesus was inflicted on him, though innocent, by God, as an atonement to himself for with-holding merited punishment from the truly guilty. And this is the real point in discussion. The Editor will admit that the ways of God in bestowing happiness on some and leaving others in our eyes more worthy of divine favor to wretchedness and misery are inscrutable; yet on the bare fact that the innocent Jesus was ordained to die on the cross he pretends to rest the conclusion, as the only possible one, that this death he suffered to satisfy the justice of his Maker. Was it for this that John the Baptist was beheaded? Was it for this that Zechariah was slain? Was it as an atonement for the sins of the rest of mankind that Jerusalem was suffered to "stone the Prophets and kill those who were sent to her?" The Editor will not admit that it was; yet the proposed inference from the bare fact would be as legitimate in these cases as in that of Jesus. The plain and obvious conclusion to be drawn from the text is that God prepared for Christ a body that he might communicate a perfect code of divine law to mankind, and that he loved him for the devotion with which he fulfilled his divine commission, regardless of the comfort or safe-

ty of that body and his readiness to lay it down when it suited the purpose of the Maker.

The Revd. Editor expresses his indignation at the mode of reasoning adopted by me in the passages above quoted; saying, "Should not a creature, a worm of the dust who cannot fully comprehend the mysteries of his own being, pause before he arraign his Maker of gross injustice, and charge him with having founded all religion on an act of palpable iniquity?" (page 529)

There appears here a most strange mistake on the part of the Editor. It is he who seems to me to be labouring to prove the absurdity that God, the Almighty and all-merciful, is capable of a palpable iniquity—determined to have punishment, though he leave quite unpunished; inflicting the marks of his wrath on the innocent *for the purpose* of sparing those who justly deserve the weight of its terrors. If he mean to object to the rashness of applying the limited capacity of the human understanding to judge the unsearchable things of the wisdom of God, and therefore denies my right, as a worm of the dust, to deduce any thing from human ideas inimical to his view of the divine will, I can only say that I have

for my example that of a fellow-worm in his own argument to shew the necessity that the Almighty labored under to have his justice satisfied. For I find this very Editor in his endeavour to prove the doctrine of the atonement arguing (page 506.) thus "He who has kept the law has not broken it, and he who has broken it cannot have kept it: that the same man therefore should incur its penalty for violating it, and also deserve its reward for keeping it, is an *outrage on common sense.*" "This will clearly appear, if we refer to *human laws* imperfect as they are." "Apply this to the divine law." "For him therefore to be rewarded as one who had kept the divine law would be directly contrary to righteousness." "Human judges enquire not repentance of the robber or murderer but respecting his guilt."

From these passages does it not appear as if the Editor were of opinion that it is quite right and proper to apply human reason as a standard by which to judge what must be the will of God when he thinks it supports his views of the ways of Providence; but that on the contrary it is blasphemous and rebellious against the divine majesty to deduce from human reason conclusions from the scriptures contrary to his interpretations of them? The Edi-

tor has not attempted to dispute that applied to human affairs the motive to which he assigns the will of God in ordaining the death of Jesus on the cross would be palpably iniquitous. Should not this induce him to pause and permit nothing but the most express and positive declaration couched in language not capable of being explained in a metaphorical sense, to sway him to a belief so irreconcilable to common sense? Yet he is willing to assume at once this conclusion on the bare fact that Jesus was provided with a body.

Do not orthodox divines often offer it as a reason for the necessity of an atonement being made for the crimes of men that it would be inequitable in the perfect nature of the just God to remit sin without some sort of punishment being inflicted for it as a satisfaction to his justice? Do they not in consequence represent the death of Jesus *as an atonement* for the sins of *mankind?* If they do and are allowed to do so, I think myself also authorized to urge in reference to human notions of justice that "it would be a piece of gross iniquity to afflict one innocent being who had all the human feelings and who had never transgressed the will of God, with the death of the cross for crimes committed by others especially when he declares such

great aversion to it." But if the Editor abandon this mode of reasoning and confess the unsearchable, inscrutable nature both of divine justice and of divine mercy, I am perfectly ready and willing to do the same.

The Editor now refers to the prophets; (page 533.) saying that Isaiah in Ch. VII. "predicting the birth of Christ identifies his divine and his human nature." As Isaiah VII. 14. and IX. 6. have no relation whatever to the doctrine of atonement, I deem it proper to defer the noti e of them to the subsequent chapter on the Trinity.

The Editor in his next quotation from Isaiah first introduces Ch. XI. "And he shall make him (Jesus) of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord;" but my limited capacity has failed to enable me to ascertain what he really means to establish by the quotation of this passage (page 536). The Editor was in the course of an attempt to prove the deity and the atonement of Jesus Christ, but the force of tru h would appear to have induced him here to cite a verse which, containing such phrases as—"make him of quick understanding" and "in the fear of the Lord" go to prove his created nature. In like man-

ner I must confess my inability to discover any allusion whatever to the atonement in his next quotation from Isaiah, XIX. 19 and 20.

The Editor having endeavoured in his former review to prove the doctrine of the atonement from the application of the term "Saviour" to Jesus, I noticed in my Second Appeal that "we find the title Saviour applied frequently in the divine writings to those who have been endued with the power of saving nations, whether in a spiritual sense by the imparting of the divine will, or by affording temporary protection to them; altho' none of those saving prophets or princes atoned for the sins of their fellow creatures by their death:" (page 64.) and that "all those who have been instrumental in effecting the deliverance of their fellow creatures from evils of whatever nature, were dependant themselves upon God, and only instruments in his hand." The Editor though unable to deny this fact, thus turns away the subject saying; "It surely required but little knowledge to discern, that a man's delivering his country does not elevate him to an equality with God, or that to overcome an invading enemy is an act totally different from saving sinners from their sins:" but the force of truth again makes the Revd. Editor quote here

the following passage ("and he *shall send them* a Saviour and a great one and he shall deliver them") which does not only refute his own position, but proves what I advanced in my Second Appeal; that is, as Christ and others who saved people at different times in their peculiar capacities were dependent themselves upon God and only instruments in his hands." Is it not possible for God who could raise, as the Editor confesses, personages to save men by their miraculous strength from the grasp of their enemies, to raise one to save mankind from sin through his divine instructions? If not, how should we reconcile such disavowal of the power of God to the following assertion of the evangelist Matthew that the people "glorified God who had given such power to men?" (IX. 8.) and if Jesus was not entitled to the appellation of a saviour from the saving power of his divine instructions, in what sense should we understand those declarations of Jesus himself to be found even in a single Gospel John V. 24. VI. 63. XV. 3.

To his question "When previously to Christ's coming did the Egyptians cry to Jehovah for deliverance and when previously was Israel the third with Egypt and the Assyrians?" my answer must be in the negative; that is,

neither previous to Christ's coming did the Egyptians cry to Jehovah and join the Assyrians and Israel, a blessing in the midst of the land, nor have they subsequently to the coming of Jesus, up to this day, cried to the God of Israel, or joined Israel and the Assyrians in asking a divine blessing.

The Editor says page 537 that in Ch. XXXV. the blessings of Christ's kingdom are declared in the most glowing language" I do not dispute it in the least. If verse 10. (the ransomed of the Lord shall return &c.) have any allusion to Jesus, it must have reference to his implicit obedience to the will of Jehovah, even to the laying down of his own life for the safety of mankind; as explained in my Second Appeal pages 57 and 58. Any one who has a tolerable knowledge of the idiom of Hebrew or Arabic, or even of Persian, must be aware that the word "Ransom" פדיום or فداء is often used to express extreme attachment or obedience, without implying an actual sacrifice as an atonement for sins.

He again quotes Isaiah XLII. "He shall not cry &c. The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness sake;" but I am una-

ble also to discover what these quotations have to do with Christ's atoning for sin as a sacrifice in lieu of goats and bullocks. So 2 Cor. V. 21. "for he hath made him to be sin." &c. has no reference to the atonement which the Editor insists upon: It implies no more than that "God hath made him subject to sufferings and death, the usual punishment and consequence of sin, as if he had been a sinner, though he were guilty of no sin; that we in and by him might be made righteous, by a righteousness imputed to us by God." See Locke's works vol. VIII. page 232.

The Revd. Editor now refers to Ch. LIII. of Isaiah, laying great stress upon such phrases as the following found in that chapter;—"surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." "He was wounded for our transgressions" the Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all." "He shall bear their iniquities." Do these sentences prove that he like a sacrificial "lamb" or "sheep" atoned for the sins of others? Did ever a sacrificial lamb or goat bear the iniquities of men? The scapegoats are stated to have borne the iniquities of Israel, a circumstance far from being applicable to Christ even typically; for he, as was predicted, made no escape from the hands of his ene-

mies. My readers may peruse the whole of Ch. LIII and may find that it conveys but the idea that Jesus as a prince, though innocent himself, was to suffer afflictions or rather death for the transgressions of his guilty people while interceding for them with a king mightier than himself.

To this question of the Editor "Is not our repentance sufficient to make atonement with the all-merciful?" My answer must be in the affirmative, since we find the direct authority of the author of this religion and his forerunner John the Baptist requiring us to have recourse to repentance as the means of procuring pardon for sin. Vide page 22. Had the human race never transgressed or had they repented sincerely of their transgressions, the son of God need not have been sent to teach them repentance for the pardon of their sins; to lay before them the divine law calculated to prevent their further transgressions; the fulfilment of which commission was at the cost of his life.

As I have already noticed in page 60 et seq. the Editor's reference to human ideas of justice in support of the doctrine of atonement, and his censuring me for the same mode of reference to

natural equity. I will not renew the subject here.

The Editor seems contented with the quotation of only two passages of Jeremiah: viz. Ch. XXIII. "Behold the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch" &c. and Ch XXXI. as being quoted in Hebrews VIII. "Behold the days come saith the Lord when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the land of Judah. I will put my law in their inward parts &c." The Editor then quotes (page 539) I Cor I 60. "Christ is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption." But what these quotations have to do with the vicarious sacrifice of Christ I am again at a loss to perceive; being able to discover in them nothing more than a prophecy and its fulfilment, that Christ was to be sent to direct mankind to sincerity in worship, righteousness in conduct, sanctification in purity of mind, and salvation by repentance.

The Editor then advances that "Ezekiel also predicts the promised redeemer in Ch. XXXIV. 13. "He says I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; and he shall be

their shepherd." I never denied in any of my publications that Jesus was sent as the promised Messiah; nor did I ever interpret the above passages, as some Jewish writers, that the Messiah would be not only of the race of David but also of his spirit. How is it then, that the Editor thinks it necessary to attempt so often to prove the kingdom and redemption of Jesus as the promised Messiah in the course of his arguments in favour of the atonement? He afterwards quotes Daniel IX. 26. "Shall Messiah be cut off but not for himself." There is no term in the original Hebrew passage answering to the words "*but*" or "*himself*" found in the English version. We find in the Hebrew ואין לו — "no person or nothing for him;" that is "Shall Messiah be cut off and no one be for him." The translators used the term "but" instead of "and" as in the Hebrew, and the term "himself" in lieu of "him." In illustration I shall here cite the same phrase found in other instances both in the original Hebrew scriptures and their translation also in the English version. Exodus XXII. 1. אין לו דמים "No blood for him." Numbers XXVII. 4. אין לו בן "He hath no son." Psalm LXXII. 12. ואין עזר לו "And him that hath no helper." Daniel XI. 45. ואין עזר לו "And none shall help him." But even were we to ad-

mit this mistranslation or perversion of the original scriptures, the words "shall the Messiah be cut off but not for himself," would to my mind convey nothing more than that the Messiah should be cut off, not for any guilt he committed himself, but by the fault of his subjects, who continued to rebel against the divine law though instructed by their intercessor even at the hazard of his own life.

The Editor quotes Hosea III. "After that the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God and David their King &c." and Joel II. 28. "And it shall come to pass afterwards that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy" &c. and also Amos IX. "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen" &c. Had he been pleased to shew the tendency of these quotations to the proof of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus, I would endeavour to examine the connection between them; as he has omitted to do so, and their relation to the question is certainly not obvious I must spare myself the trouble.

The Revd. Editor says (page 541) "nor does Obadiah in his short prophecy wholly omit the Redeemer's Kingdom. He alludes thereto in

verse 21. "And saviours, shall come upon mount Zion to judge the mounts of Esau and the kingdom shall be Jehovah's." To justify the application to Jesus of the noun "Saviours" though found in the plural form, he thus argues "should he (the author of the appeals) reply that as the plural number "Saviour" is used, this cannot refer to Christ, we ask him whether he has not (page 98) affirmed that "the plural form is often used in a singular sense as of his masters, meaning his master has given him a wife" The Editor as a diligent student of the Scriptures should have known that the noun in question "Saviours" being accompanied with the plural verb ויעלו "they shall come up," is by no means an analogous case to that of the term "Masters" as found in Exodus XXI. 4. which is connected with the verb singular יתן whereas in Neh. IX. 27. the term "Saviours" is associated with the verb in the plural form and the past tense, as well as with the pronoun plural.

I must therefore maintain the correctness of reading "Saviours" in Obadiah as required in the former alternative of the question put by the Editor, (page 541, L. 34.); finding myself unable to "acknowledge the triune God as proposed by him in the latter alternative: for

having relinquished the notion of the triune, quadrune and decimune gods which I once professed, when immersed in the grosser polytheism prevailing among modern Hindoos; I cannot reconcile it to my understanding to find plausibility in one case, while the same notion is of acknowledged absurdity in another. The Editor admits (page 536) the application of the term Saviour to human individuals as pointed out by me, (Second Appeal page 145) yet he is anxious to prove the doctrine of the atonement by the application of that very term to Jesus.

The Editor says (page 542.) that "Micah in Ch. IV. describes Christ's kingdom nearly in the same terms with Isaiah, and in Ch. V. he repeats the place of his birth "thou Bethlehem Ephratah, out of thee shall he come forth unto me—whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting." The testimony to the eternal deity of Christ given in connection with his birth as man, it is wrong to overlook." Any testimony relating to the birth of Jesus having nothing to do with his atonement, is not in place here, but I will examine the verse here cited in the subsequent part of this discussion, when we come to the subject of the Trinity.

He quotes again Nahum I. 15. for the purpose of proving Christ's kingdom, which is a subject totally foreign to that of the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus. "Habakkuk" (says the Editor page 542) "was evidently no stranger to the doctrine founded on the atonement;" and he then quotes the passage "the just shall live by his faith" as corroborated by Paul Rom. I. and Gal. III. 2; and "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of Jehovah" &c But what faith in, and knowledge of God, as well as faith in the perfection of his attributes, and in the prophets sent by him, has to do with the atonement I am at a loss to discover. Does the bare mention of faith by Habakkuk or other prophets prove his or their familiarity with the sacrificial death of Jesus?

He quotes the passage of Haggai II. "thus saith Jehovah: the desire of all nations shall come and will fill this house with glory—the glory of this latter house shall be greater than that of the former, saith Jehovah of hosts" which the Editor thinks affords decided proof respecting both the atonement and the deity of Christ. It is however too deep for my shallow understanding to discover from this passage an allusion to either of these doctrines, much less that it is a decided proof of them. Were we to an-

derstand by the word "temple" in both instances in the verse a *material* one, which is evident from it's context in the prophecy was alone in the contemplation of Haggai, we must be persuaded to believe that the latter temple was more magnificently built by Zerubbabel and Joshua in the reign of Darius than the former built by Solomon. Should the *spiritual* temple be understood by the latter term in the above, it would be regarded naturally superior to a material one without the necessity of "Jehovah's coming into it cloathed in our nature."

He quotes Zechariah III. 8 and 9. and VI. 12 and 13. wherein there is not the slightest mention of the atonement. As to his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus from these passages I will notice it in a subsequent chapter. The phrase found in the verse ("I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day") does not attribute the removal of the iniquities of the land of Israel to the sacrificial death of Jesus, so as to justify the Editor in quoting it as a proof of the doctrine of the atonement. Besides the verse can by no means be applied to the death of Jesus whether vicarious or accidental, since after the day of his crucifixion the Israelites so far from being freed

from sins, continued more vehemently than ever to pursue sinful conduct in their violent persecution of Christians. So the Jews have been punished to this day, as Christians believe, on account of their outrages upon the body of Jesus and their disobedience to him The remaining passage of Zechariah (age 543—548.) and verse 1st of Ch. III. of Malachi, (page 54°.) quoted by the Editor in support of the deity of Jesus, I will notice afterwards.

I am sorry I cannot agree with the Editor in his assertion (page 549) that "had our Lord himself made no direct declaration respecting the design of his death, his referring his disciples to those predictions already named would have been sufficient, particularly in their circumstances," for it would be strange to suppose that Jesus should have omitted to inculcate so important a doctrine and so fundamental for salvation, (according to the Editor) both before and after his resurrection, while he was constantly enjoining love to God, to neighbours, and to each other, and also repentance in case of failure in obedience. How is it possible to think, unless biassed by early prejudices, that a teacher, a truly divine teacher, who by declaring himself publicly the son of God* and the king of the Jews,* as predicted, brought death upon

* John XIX. 7 and 12.

himself, should have kept concealed the doctrine of the atonement, if such were the main source of salvation. from his own apostles, even after his resurrection; and have left them to deduce so material a point from the obscure predictions of the prophets which are susceptible of so many different interpretations.

The Editor then affirms that "it is evident that direct intimations of his nature were not withheld: such were, his declaring to them (his apostles) that he came to give his life a ransom for many,—his conversing with Moses and Elias—Luke IX. 31. his declaring that the son of man should be betrayed into the hands of men and be killed and rise again the third day — that he was about to give his flesh for the life of the world and to lay down his life for his sheep — and his discourse with them "This is my body which is broken for you." "This is my blood of the new Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." "Thus it is written and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day." As the Revd. Editor quoted some of these verses in his former review, I noticed them in the Second Appeal (page 57). Entirely overlooking my observations, however, he has thought proper to repeat them here with some

additions. This is indeed a strange mode of conducting a controversy, but it lays me under the necessity of again adducing my remarks in the Second Appeal on those passages. They are as follow. "Do these passages reasonably convey any thing more than the idea that Jesus was invested with a divine commission to deliver instructions leading to eternal beatitude, which whosoever should receive should live for ever? and that the saviour, foreseeing that the imparting of those instructions would, by exciting the anger and enemity of the superstitious Jews, cause his life to be destroyed, yet hesitated not to persevere in their promulgation—as if a king, who hazards his life to procure freedom and peace for his subjects, were to address himself to them saying, "I lay down my life for you." This interpretation is fully confirmed by the following. Luke IV. 43. "And he said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore I am sent." II. 47 48 49. "And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they (his parents) saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, how is it

that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my father's business?" Wherein Jesus declares, that the sole object of his commission was to preach and impart divine instructions. Again, he instructed his disciples in the divine law and will, as appears from the following text. "For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee and they have believed that thou didst send me." (John XVII 8.) Jesus in communing with God manifests that he had completed the object of his commission by imparting divine commandments to mankind. "I have glorified thee in the earth, *I have finished* the work which thou gavest me to do." Had his death on the cross been the work or part of the work, for the performance of which Jesus came into this world, he as the founder of truth would not have declared himself *to have finished* the work prior to his death. I now beg that the Editor will be pleased to reconcile all the above passages to his position that the death of Jesus on the cross was the sole object of his appearnce in this world; and that his precepts was a mere code of morality inadequate to procure salvation. Had not Jesus disregarded his life, and suffered his blood to be shed as predicted in the

delivery of the will of the Father, the whole of the Jews would have still remained sunk in superstition and the Gentiles in idolatry, and there would have been no perfect security for the remission of sins and the attainment of eternal comfort in those sayings. Hence the gracious benefactor alludes to this act of delivery from sins through divine instructions even at the expence of his own life, and not to an actual sacrificial death as an equal value or compensation for the sin pardoned; since the new Testament declares that God forgives mankind *freely* without any equivalent. Romans III. 24. "Being justified *freely*, (δωρεαν *gratis*) by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." So Romans VIII 32. 15 16 and 18. confirms the idea of justification by the free grace of God. For the further illustration of this subject I quote the paraphrase on the above cited verse (Rom III. 24) by Locke, one of the greatest men that ever lived, and his notes on its different expressions. Locke's Works Vol. 8th page 304 Paraphrase on verses 24 and 25. "Being made righteous gratis, by the favor of God, through the redemption which is by Jesus Christ; whom God hath set forth to be the propitiatory, or mercy seat in his own blood, for the manifestation of his (God's) righteousness, by passing over their transgressions, formerly

committed, which he hath bore with hitherto, so as to withhold his hand from casting off the nation of the Jews, as their past sins deserved."

Note on the word Redemption verse 24. "Redemption signifies deliverance, but not deliverance from every thing but deliverance from that, to which a man is in subjection or bondage. Nor does redemption by Jesus Christ import, there was any compensation made to God, by paying what was of equal value, in consideration whereof they were delivered; for that is inconsistent with what St. Paul expressly says here, viz that sinners are justified by God gratis, and of his free bounty. What this redemption is, St. Paul tells us, Eph. I. 7. Col. I. 14. even the forgiveness of sins But if St. Paul had not been so express in defining what he means by redemption, they yet would be thought to lay too much stress upon the criticism of a word, in the translation, who would thereby force from the word, in the original, a necessary sense, which it is plain it hath not. That redeeming in the sacred scripture language, signifies not precisely paying an equivalent, is so clear, that nothing can be more. I shall refer

my reader to three or four places amongst a great number, Exod. VI. 6 Deut. VII. 8. and XV. 12. and XXIV. 18 But if any one will, from the literal signification of the word in English, persist in it, against Paul's declarations, that it necessarily implies an equivalent price paid, I desire him to consider to whom: and that, if we will strictly adhere to the metaphor, it must be to those, whom the redeemed are in bondage to, and from whom we are redeemed, viz. Sin and Satan. If he will not believe his own system for this, let him believe St. Paul's words, Tit. II. 14. "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity." Nor could the price be paid to God, in strictness of justice (for that is made the argument here;) unless the same person ought, by that strict justice, to have both the thing redeemed, and the price paid for its redemption. For it is to God we are redeemed, by the death of Christ; Rev. V. 9. "Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood."

Note upon the word mercy-seat verse 25. ἱλαστηριον signifies propitiatory, or mercy-seat, and not propitiation, as Mr. Mede has rightly observed upon this place, in his discourse on God's house."

The Editor fills about a page and half (a part of 550 and the whole of 551) with quotations from the writings of the apostles, to substantiate the doctrine of the atonement, beginning with Rom. III. 24. already quoted by me; but as those teachers merely illustrated the sayings of their gracious Master, their writings must be understood with reference only to what had been taught by Him. I will therefore not prolong the present subject of discussion by examining those passages separately, especially as I have already noiced some of them in the course of the examination of the Psalms and prophets. Being desirous to shew that my interpretation of these is fully supported by scriptural authorities, I will only refer to a few texts explanatory of the terms, sacrifice, ransom, offering, and the taking away the sins of the world as ascribed to Jesus. Rom. V. 10. Heb. II. 17. Eph. V. 2. Heb. V. 1. VIII. 3. IX. 23 26. Heb. IX 14. Tit. II. 12 13 and 14. Heb. XIII. 12. Rev. I. 5. Eph. I. 7. Luke I. 77. Math. XX. 28. Mark. X. 45. 1. Tim. II. 6.

Now I beg that my reader will be pleased to determine whether it would be more consistent with the context, and with the benevolent spirit of the Christian dispensation to under-

stand such words literally, and thus found the salvation attainable by Christianity upon flesh and blood human or divine; or whether it would not rather be thoroughly reasonable and scriptural as well as consistent with the religion of Jesus to take them in a spiritual sense as explained by the apostles themselves.

As the Editor's illustrative remarks upon the atonement (pages 552 and 553) rest entirely on the arguments previously adduced I will leave them unnoticed, having already examined those in the preceding chapters; except only his queries "what shall we say to his impugning (page 108) the doctrine of Christ's divine and human nature even after having acknowledged it in chapter the second — and to his ridiculing his intercession &c." to which I must reply. It is perfectly optional with the Editor to say for or against any one whatever his conscience may permit; nevertheless I shall from the dictates of my own conscience reject absolutely such unaccountable ideas as a mixed nature of God and man as maintained by the Editor, as I have previously rejected the idea of a mixed nature of God, man, and lion (নৃসিংহাবতার) in which Hindoos profess their faith. I have not the most distant recollection of acknowledging Christ's divine and human

nature and shall therefore feel obliged if the Editor will have the goodness to point out in what passage of Ch. 2d. of my Appeal I acknowledged this mystery. I have never, so far as I am aware, ridiculed even in thought the intercession of Jesus for mankind, I therefore hope that Christian charity will restrain the Editor from imputing to me in future such a charge. I only intended to refute the argument adduced by Trinitarians that no being can intercede with another being for a third one, unless the mediator be possessed of the nature of the being with whom as well as of those for whom he intercedes.

To this assertion of the Editor "the blood of no *mere creature* could take away sin," I add the assertion also maintained by the Editor that "the creator is not composed of blood and flesh," and leave to him to say if the blood of Jesus was not that of a creature whose blood it was. It is evident from the circumstance of the blood of a creature being unable to take away sin and the creator having no blood, that the taking away of sin can have no connection with blood or a bloody sacrifice.

The Editor declares (page 554) that "no one but Jehovah the unchangeable God could

atone for sin, justify the sinner, and change his heart: the father himself witnesses that it is Jehovah whom he hath appointed to this glorious work." "He humbled himself by becoming in our nature the mediator between God and men." Nothing that I can conceive but prejudice in favor of the Trinity can prevent the Editor from perceiving gross inconsistency between his declaring Jesus to be the unchangeable Jehovah and also to have been appointed by Jehovah, according to whose will the former Jehovah, humbled himself in becoming in our nature a mediator. How could the unchangeable Jehovah be endued with a new honor which he had not prior to his appointment by the latter Jehovah? How could the unchangeable God change his condition by assuming a new nature? If the acceptance of a new state of honour, the assuming of a new nature, or the alteration of properties such as magnitude, and other conditions, be not considered as changes in an object, all phenomena may safely, according to the Editor's maxim, be called unchangeable; and consequently, the application of the term "unchangeable" being common to Jehovah and those who are not Jehovah can imply no peculiar ground of distinction or reverence for Jehovah. The Editor says (page 555.) "nor does it (the scripture) give us the least hint that

God ever has imparted any one infinite perfection to a finite creature. This indeed is impossible in its own nature." I therefore beg to ask whether or not on the same ground it is not impossible in its own nature that the whole of the omnipresent God should be brought into a circumference of a small space, subjected to all human feelings, and clothed at one time with two opposite natures, human and divine.

The Revd. Editor in the concluding part of the subject of the atonement attempts to prove the infinite perfection of Jesus, forgetting perhaps the denial made by Jesus himself of omniscience as well as of omnipotence, as narrated in the evangelical writings. He entirely avoids here noticing what I stated in proof of the finite effects of Christ's appearance in the world; which I now repeat, and beg that the Editor will favor me with a reply thereto. My argument is "that the effects of Christ's appearance on earth, whether with respect to the salvation or condemnation of mankind, were *finite* and therefore suitable to the nature of a finite being to accomplish, is evident from the fact that to the present time millions of human beings are daily passing through the world, whom the doctrines he taught have never reached and who of

course must be considered as excluded from the benefit of his having died for the remission of their sins" (Second Appeal page 62.) Besides it is worth observing that an avowal of the beginning of creation and of its end amounts to a proof of the finite number of creatures however numerous they may be; therefore an atonement even for the remission of the sins of all of them must be of a finite nature.

Should it be alleged that the sins committed by a single individual, in the limited period of his life, though they are finite in themselves, yet are committed against the infinite God and thereby they are infinite, and that an atonement on the part of an infinite being is therefore necessary for their remission: I shall reply; In the first place the assertion that the guilt committed against an infinite being is infinite in its consequences, is entirely unsupported by reason or proof and is contrary to scriptural authorities; for we find that the Israelites were, from time to time, afflicted with finite punishment for the sins they committed against the infinite God. 1 Chronicles XXI. 11. So Gad came to David and said unto him; thus saith the Lord choose thee either *three years famine* or *three months* to be destroyed before

thy foes, while that the sword of thine enemies overtaketh thee, or *else three days* the sword of the Lord, even the pestilence, in the land, and the angel of the Lord destroying throughout all the coasts of Israel &c. 15 And God sent an angel unto Jerusalem to destroy it and as he was destroying, the Lord *beheld, and he repented him of the evil,* and said to the angel that destroyed, It is enough, stay now thine hand" &c Judges XIII. 1. "And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord and the Lord delivered them into the hand of the Philistines *forty years.*

In the second place were we to admit the truth of this argument, we must upon the same ground, as far as reason suggests, esteem a good act done for the honor of the commandment of the infinite God, or a prayer offered to propitiate the divine majesty to be also worthy of infinite reward as its effect. Under these circumstances we cannot help observing that among those that believe in any revelation, either true or received as true, there is probably no man that has not performed at least one single righteous act during the whole period of his life; but as he is a mortal and imperfect being, he cannot be supposed to have escaped every sin in this tempting world: Every man

then must be both guilty of infinite sin and an agent of infinite virtue. If we suppose that this very person is to be punished for eternity, according to the Editor, for the infinite sin he has committed, there will be no opportunity of his enjoying an infinite reward for his good work; But according to the position he must be either rewarded for his good or punished for his evil actions for eternity, while justice requires that he should experience the consequences of both. Would it be consistent with the perfect nature of the just God to afflict one with eternal punishment for his guilt, leaving, at the same time, his good deeds unnoticed entirely, though performed with a view to the glory of God?—Is it not therefore scriptural as well as reasonable that all men should be judged after death according to their good and evil works; and then that through the intercession of one who stands as a mediator between God and man, those who have, through Christ, truly repented, shall be admitted to enjoy infinite beatitude by the free bounty of the father of the universe, to which they are not entitled by their own merit.

As to such phrases as *everlasting fire* or *everlasting punishments* found in the English version, I beg to refer my readers to the origi-

nal Greek, in which the term αιωνιος being derived from αιων denotes frequently *duration* or *ages*; that is "durable fire" or "durable punishments." Besides they may find the term "everlasting" when applied to an object *not divine*, implies long duration: Genesis XVII. 8. "And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, &c." XLIX. 26. "The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills" &c. Habakkuk III. 6. "He stood and measured the earth: He beheld and drove asunder the nations; and the everlasting mountains were scattered and the perpetual hills did bow." Vide Note in the Second Appeal page 133.

CHAPTER III.

Inquiry into the doctrine of the Trinity.

SECTION 1.

The Pentateuch and Psalms.

I NOW proceed to examine the doctrine of the Trinity, a term which although it is frequently introduced both in orthodox writings and conversation as the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, yet is not once found in any part of the sacred books.

The first position the Editor advances, in support of the deity of Jesus. (page 556.) is, that the angel who is said in Gen. XLVIII. 16. to have redeemed Jacob was Jesus himself as he appears "in the scripture distinct from the Father and able to redeem," and that the same redeeming being was the angel who spoke to Jacob in a dream "I am the God of Bethel." (Gen. XXXI. 11.) and appeared to Moses "in a flame of fire out of the midst of an unconsumed bush." (Exodus III. 2.) and who came up from Gilgal to Bochim and said "I made

you go up out of Egypt" &c. (Judges II. 1.) and called unto Abraham out of the heaven and said "Thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me." (Gen. XXII. 12.) whence the Editor concludes that Christ being the redeeming angel, and that redeeming angel being the angel that spoke of himself as God in other instances, Christ is God. The Editor altho' he fills more than two pages with this argument yet never thinks of producing a single authority for his inference that the angel who redeemed Jacob was Christ or for his identifying that angel with those angels whom the Editor considers as Jehovah the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The only reason he assigns for his first supposition is that the angel appeared "distinct from the Father and able to redeem;" hence he was Christ who is represented as the redeemer of his people. Can the circumstance of the performance of similar acts by two persons identify one with the other? If so, we must on the same ground identify God with the human race, the scriptures having ascribed to them both such attributes as mercy, wrath, reward and punishment; and we also on the same principle must maintain the identity of Jesus with all those that are said in the sacred books to have redeemed people at different times. Isaiah

LXIII. 9. "In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence *saved* them, in his love and in his pity he *redeemed* them, and he bare them and carried them all the days of old," Ruth IV. 14. "And the woman said unto Naomi, blessed be the Lord who hath not left thee this day without a *redeemer** גאל that his name may be famous in Israel" Nehemiah V. 8. "we after our ability have *redeemed* our brethren the Jews, who were sold unto the heathen."

Were we to admit for a moment that the angel who redeemed Jacob was indeed Jesus, it would necessarily follow, according to the Editor, that there was Christ-man-Jesus, God-Jesus and Angel-Jesus; that is, that Christ is possessed of a three-fold nature and that he is to be esteemed as an obedient servant in his human capacity, as a faithful messenger in his angelical natnre, and as an independent master and employer in his divine essence!

---

* In the English Bible the term kinsman is here employed. This however is inaccurate which will appear by referring to the context. It is thereby made evident that, before the birth of this son, Ruth and Naomi had Boaz and others as their kinsmen, and therefore the expression "who hath not left thee this day without a kinsman" cannot have reference to the child then born. Besides the synonimous term "restorer of thy life" used in verse 15th for the child, sufficiently determines the meaning.

If it be alleged that the term angel is here only figuratively applied to Jesus, I shall reply that we find nothing in the verse that can prevent the application of the term "angel" to the angel of God in its literal sense; no one, under such a circumstance, can be justified in adopting a metaphorical meaning: Nevertheless we will, in conformity to the spirit of the sacred writings, maintain the opinion that God is the only true redeemer, and that his Christ, his angels and his prophets, are redeemers in a secondary sense; that is, they are the instruments in the hand of God in his works of redemption. If the scriptures do not scruple to call angels like Jesus "Gods" and "Sons of God" in a metaphorical sense, we should not wonder if we find the term "redeemer" applied to any angel of God in an inferior sense. Psalm XCVII. 7. "Worship him ye Gods" Judges XIII. 21—22. "Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of the Lord, and Manoah said unto his wife we shall surely die, because we have seen God." Job I. 6. "The sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord." As to his latter supposition, that the angel who redeemed Jacob was the same that appeared to him in a dream and to Abraham and to others on different occasions, the Editor neither attempts to assign reasons nor does he

endeavour to shew any authority for his assertion. He might perhaps lay stress on the definite article prefixed to the word "angel" in several of these instances in the English version, (which he cannot do without total disregard to the idiom and use of the Hebrew language) and thereby might attempt to substantiate the identity of one angel with the other. He would however in this case soon perceive his own error, if he should refer to Judges XIII. 13. where *the* angel (with the definite article in the common version) says to Manoah "Though thou detain me I will not eat of thy bread, and if thou wilt offer a burnt-offering, thou must offer it unto the Lord." declaring himself unworthy of the worship due to God alone;—or if he should turn to 2 Samuel XXIV. 16. where the angel is represented as an obedient messenger of God, a destroying instrument in the hands of Jehovah. Many other instances might be cited of a similar nature. How then can Jesus, if he be the being termed *the* angel, speak of himself (as the Editor supposes) as God in one instance, while in others he renounces his own deity, and even declares that he destroys the lives of thousands by the command of a superior being?

Let us now examine whether or not the prophets, as well as the angels of God,

in the delivery of his message and his will, did not often speak in behalf of God as if God himself had spoken. I confine my notice to the prophets; for were I to point out any angel speaking in behalf of Jehovah without distinction of persons, the Editor might attempt to deduce from this very circumstance that that angel was God the Son.

Instances similar to the following abound in the old Testament Isaiah X. 4—7. Without *me* they shall bow down under the prisoners, and they shall fall under the slain. For all *this his* anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. O Assyrian the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets. Howbeit *he* meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so; but it is in his heart to destroy, and cut off nations not a few." Ch. XXIX. 1. "Wo to Ariel, to Ariel the city where David dwelt! add ye year to year; let them kill sacrifices; yet I will distress Ariel and there shall be heaviness and sorrow and it shall be unto me as Ariel. I will camp against thee round about

and will lay siege against thee with a mount and I will raise forts against thee." Micah IV. 13. "Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion, for I will make" &c. Micah V. 1. "Now gather thyself in troops, O daughter of troops: he hath laid siege against us: they shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek. But thou Beth-lehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel, &c." Now I presume the Editor will not propose to indentify those prophets with the Deity; yet he must admit that his argument, if it have any weight at all, must force us to submit to that monstrous conclusion.

In the course of this argument the Revd. Editor asserts that "Christ also in John VIII. declares himself to be precisely what Jehovah declares himself in Exodus III. 14. "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, *I am* hath sent me unto you." John VIII. 24. "If ye believe not that I am (*he* being supplied) ye shall die in your sins" and v. 58. "verily, verily I say unto you, before Abraham was I am." How is it possible that the Editor a diligent student of the Bible for thirty or forty years can have made such a palpable mistake as to assert that the declaration of Jehovah in Exod. III. and that of

Jesus in John VIII. are *precisely the same*? It is but his zeal to support the doctrine of the Holy Trinity that can have prevented him from examining the phrases found in these two chapters. In Exod. God says "Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel "אשר אהיה אהיה*" "the being who *is* being" hath sent me unto you; a phrase in Hebrew which implies Him who alone can be described as only mere being or existence, and which is translated in the Greek Septuagint though not† very correctly "εγω ειμι 'ο ων" "I am the being." But in the Gospel of John VIII. 24. the words are "I am" (*he* or *Christ*) and in the original Greek "εγω ειμι" "I am" without the addition of "'ο ων" "the being," as is found in the Septuagint: In the Hebrew translation of John VIII. 24. "אני הוא" or "I he" is found. So in v. 58. we find only "εγω ειμι" or "I am." In John VIII. 24. the word "χριστος" is of course supplied in comparing with Matthew XXIV. 5. "I am Christ" and with John IV. 25—26. I would then

---

* אהיה is the future tense of היה to be which literally implies "I shall be" and is used for "I am" that is "I am and I shall be" equivalent to the "eternal being." The Jews consequently count this term among the names of God as is evident from its being used in agreement with a verb in the third person as in the above-cited verse.

† I say not very correctly, because we find in the Sept. the term אהיה rendered ο ων or the being in one instance and εγω ειμι in lieu of the same term אהיה in the other.

ask, Is אהיה אשר אהיה or "the being who *is* being" a phrase precisely the same with "εγω ειμι" or "I am?" If so, it must require a mode of argument to prove it equally beyond my comprehension with the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity which it is brought to support.

From the circumstance of Jesus' having announced "before Abraham was I am" (v. 58.) the Editor concludes that "the Jews at once understood him to declare himself God and took up stones to stone him: nor did Jesus hint that they had mistaken him;" a silence which the Editor thinks amounts to the tacit acknowledgement by Jesus of his deity. But from the context of verse the 58th. it appears clearly that the indignation of the Jews arose from the idea that Jesus declared himself not merely he cotemporary of Abraham but even gave out that before Abraham, he was; and that it was for this they attempted to stone him. It is not the only instance in which Jesus left the Jews to labour under a misconception of his meaning, for we find the same to have been the case in several other instances. Thus: John II. 19. and 21. "Jesus answered and said unto them: destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews: Forty and six years was this temple in

building and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spoke of the temple of his body." John VI. 53 and 66. VIII. 26—27. "I have many things to say and to judge of you, but he that sent me is true; and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him: they understood not that he spake to them of the Father."

The Editor mentions (page 559) that "Job also testifies that the redeemer is God;" and quotes Job. XIX. 25—26. "For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." I fully coincide with the Editor in this declaration: not Job alone but all the other writers of the sacred books testify that the true redeemer is God; and they all expected him to cast his mercy upon them both at the last moment of their life and at the last period of the world. I am at a loss to know what expression in the passage in question has induced the Editor to refer to the other texts cited, "would we know whether by God, Job means some inferior deity neither creature nor creator;" For, there can be no doubt that the term redeemer is frequently in the sacred writings applied in its

strict sense to the most high God, and that the phrases "he shall stand at last" and "I shall see God" which are also found in the above passage are often spoken of the Supreme Being without implying any necessity of understanding them as applicable to an inferior deity either creature or creator. Exodus XXXIV. 5. "And the Lord descended in the cloud and stood with him there &c." Zechariah XIV. 3—4. "Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations as when he fought in the day of battle." "And his feet will stand in that day upon the mount of Olives which is before Jerusalem." Numbers XIV. 14. That thou art seen face to face." Mathew V. 8. "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God." The phrase "at the latter day" found in v. 25 is incorrectly rendered in the English version as the translation of the Hebrew אחרון as has been already noticed in page 48.

The Editor refers his readers to Psalm 2d. last verse. "Kiss the son lest he be angry and ye perish from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are they who trust in him,"—leaving the context carefully out of sight. I therefore deem it proper to cite the preceding verses here that the public may judge whether the verse referred to by the Editor be directly

applicable to Jesus or to David—David thus relates the circumstance of the hostile disposition of the heathen kings against God and against his anointed David himself in verses 1, 2, and 3, and the despite of God at their vain boast in verses 4, 5, and 6. He then mentions in verses 7, 8, and 9, how God afforded him consolation: "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto *me* thou art my son; THIS DAY HAVE I BEGOTTEN THEE; Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession; Thou shalt *break* them with a *rod of iron;* thou shalt *dash them in pieces* like a potter's vessel." David lastly mentions what God recommended those heathen kings to do for their safety 10, 11, 12. Beware now therefore O ye kings; be instructed ye judges of the earth! serve the Lord with fear and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the son lest he be angry &c." Here Jehovah in verse 7th calls David "*My son this day have I begotten thee*" corresponding with Psalm LXXXIX. 27. "Also I will make him (David) my first born, higher than the Kings of the earth." I must again say that nothing except the violent force of early acquired prejudice can lead any one to the direct application of the term "son" (found again in verse 12th of the same Psalm relating

to the same subject,) to another than David. God again assures David in v. 8 and 9. that he would have the heathen for his possession and that he would break the heathens and dash them to pieces. So we find in Chronicles XIV. 8. "When the Philistines heard that David was* anointed king over all Israel; all the Philistines went up to seek David and David heard of it and went out against them." 16. David therefore did as God commanded him. And they smote the host of the Philistines from Gibeon even to Gazer. And the fame of David went out into *all lands* and the Lord brought the *fear of him upon all nations.*" and Ch. XVIII. 1. 8. "Now after this it came to pass that David smote the Philistines, and subdued them, and took Gath and her towns out of the hand of the Philistines. And he smote Moab: and the Moabites became David's servants, and brought gifts. And David smote Hadarezer King of Zobah unto Hamath, as he went to establish his dominion by the river Euphrates. And David took from him a thousand chariots, and seven thousand horsemen, and twenty thousand footmen: David also houghed all the chariot horses, but reserved of them an hundred chariots. And when the Syrians of Damascus came to help Hadarezer

* Vide Psalm II. 2. "against his anointed."

King of Zobah, David slew of the Syrians two and twenty thousand men. Then David put garrisons in Syria-damascus; and the Syrians became David's servants, and brought gifts. Thus the Lord preserved David *whithersoever* he went. And David took the shields of gold that were on the servants of Hadarezer, and brought them to Jerusalem. Likewise from Tibhath, and from Chun, cities of Hadarezer, brought David very much brass, wherewith Solomon made the brazen sea, and the pillars, and the vessels of brass." And also Ch. XX. 2. and 3. "And David took the crown of their King from off his head, and found it to weigh a talent of gold, and there were precious stones in it; and it was set upon David's head: and he brought also exceeding much spoil out of the city. And he brought out the people that were in it, and *cut them with saws, and harrows of iron, and with axes:* even so dealt David with all the cities of the children of Ammon. And David and all the people returned to Jerusalem." Do not such denunciations as, "Thou shalt break them with a *rod of iron*," "thou shalt dash them in pieces" found in v. 9. of the above Psalm, correspond with Chronicles XVIII. "David smote the Philistines.'—"He smote Moab."—"David smote Hadarezer."—"David slew of the Syrians two and twenty thousand

men."—"David took the crown of their king from off his head:" "and cut them (the citizens) with saws and with harrows of iron?" Are not these directly suitable to the history of David the conqueror, called by God his son, rather than to the office and nature of the meek and lowly Jesus, who, though most exalted among the sons of God, was himself the victim of the rage of unbelievers? Even upon the trinitarian system, Do not such sentences as "*ask* I shall give thee the heathen for an inheritance," corresponding with the passages in Chronicles, "The Lord brought the fear of him (David) *upon all nations*—" "Thus the Lord preserved David whithersoever he went," admit of better application to David, whose glory depended from time to time upon his supplications to God, than to Jesus, who as God himself, according to the Editor, was possessed of infinite power and glory from eternity and needed not to ask of another? Does not such address to the heathen kings as "kiss the son lest he be angry" &c. agree with the circumstances mentioned in 1 Chronicles XVIII. "The Moabites became David's servants and brought gifts:"—"The Syrians became David's servants, and brought gifts:"—and he brought out the people—and cut them with saws and horrows of iron and with axes;

even so dealt David with all the cities of the children of Ammon"?

The opponents whom David broke "with a rod of iron" were his political enemies; consequently the assertion of the Editor that "the destruction to spiritual enemies is no where in scripture described as arising from the wrath of a mere creature" has no applicability to the subject in question. As to his assertion "prophets denounced on men the wrath of God and pronounced on them a curse in his name," I only refer the Revd. Editor to 2 Kings V. 26—27. in which Elisha is said, when displeased at the conduct of his servant, to have miraculously punished him with leprosy, without pronouncing on him verbally any curse in the name of God;—and also to Exodus XXIII. 21. wherein he will find that the angels of God, if provoked, have the power of keeping away pardon from men.

It may however be fairly concluded from the authority and acts of Jesus himself, that both the angels and the prophets of God in performing miracles either of punishment or reward according as they were disposed, applied always to God for power, though they sometimes omitted to express such applica-

tions verbally. John XI. 41—42. "And Jesus (in raising Lazarus from the dead) lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me, and I knew that thou hearest me *always*."

From the words "who trust in him" found in the second psalm the Editor attempts to prove the deity of the son on the supposition that the phrase "to trust in" is exclusively applicable to God, and corroborates his opinion by Jeremiah XVII. 5., forgetting that this term though it is often used with reference to God, yet is applied sometimes to created beings. Proverbs XXXI. 11. "The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her, so that he shall have no need of spoil. Isaiah XIV. 32. "The Lord hath founded Zion and the poor of his people shall trust in it." As to Jeremiah XVII. 5 quoted by the Editor "Thus saith Jehovah cursed be he that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm and whose heart departeth from Jehovah," it of course implies that he who trusts in man independently of God should be cursed, as appears from the last sentence of the same verse "whose heart departeth from Jehovah."

The Editor quotes Psalm XXIV. "The earth is Jehovah's and the fulness thereof, the

world and they that dwell therein; for he hath founded it upon the sea and established it upon the floods" and compares it with John I. 3. "All things were made by him (the Word) and without him was not any thing made which was made." The inference which he draws from this comparison is that "In creating power Christ is equal to Jehovah." Were we to overlook the mistranslation of this verse* in the English version (which it is almost impossible not to notice) and to understand the passage as it stands in the orthodox translation, we should esteem Jesus as the cause of all created things. But we should be in this case naturally inclined to ascertain whether Jesus was an efficient or an instrumental cause of those things; since the preposition "by" found in the verse signifies either a

* All things were done by him.] "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made." Newcome: who explains it of the creation of the visible material world by Christ, as the agent and instrument of God. See his notes on verse 3 and 10. But this is a sense which the word εγενετο will not admit. γινομαι occurs upwards of seven hundred times in the new Testament, but never in the sense of create. It signifies in this gospel, where it occurs fifty-three times, to be, to come, to become, to come to pass: also, to be done or transacted. Chapter XV. 7; XIX. 36. It has the latter sense, Matthew V. 18; VI. 8; XXI. 42; XXVI. 6. All things in the christian dispensation were done by Christ; i. e. by his authority, and according to his direction; and in the ministry committed to his apostles, nothing has been done without his warrant. See John XV. 4—5. "Without me ye can do nothing" compare ver. 7, 10, 16,; John XVII. 8; Col. I. 16, 17. Cappe, ibid. (Improved version.)

principal agent of an action or an instrument therein. We find Hebrews I. 2 (as it stands in the English version) deciding the question beyond a doubt: "(God) hath in these last days spoken unto us by his *son* whom he hath appointed heir of all things *by whom* also *he made the worlds*." Ephe. III. 9. "who (God) created all things by Jesus Christ." Here all the worlds are represented as made by Jesus as an instrument in the hands of God. It is hoped that after reflecting upon this decision by the Author of these Epistles, the Editor may perhaps retract his assertion that "in creating power Christ is equal to Jehovah" and be of opinion that the world was made by the will of one being. Could not Jehovah to whom the Editor ascribes omnipotence create this world independently of another omnipotent being equal to him "in creating power?" If not, the world must be, in this case, the joint production of Jehovah and Christ, as well as of the Holy Ghost, (whom the Editor here omits to notice) and each of them must depend upon the others in creation like joint managers of a concern. Can the Editor point out any set of men or any nation professing a grosser polytheism than this? The only difference that he can show between his notion and that of avowed Polythiests must consist only in respect

of the increase or decrease of the supposed number of Creators. A distinction which will amount to nothing intrinsic. I must now leave the subject to the sound judgment of my reader.

The Editor further proceeds saying "with reference to Christ, Paul adds (1 Cor. X. 25 and 26.) "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles that eat. For the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof." He then concludes "if this Psalm (XXIV. 1.) then speak of Jehovah the father, the same absolute dominion over the earth is here ascribed to the son as to the father; if the son, he is there termed Jehovah." St. Paul here justifies the eating of whatever is sold in the shambles, referring to Psalm XXIV. 1. as his reason for such justification without the most distant allussion to Jesus: I am therefore at loss to discover the ground upon which the Editor founds his foregoing conclusion. For further illustration I quote the paraphrase by a most eminent personage on the above verses of Corinthians. "Eat whatever is sold in the shambles, without any inquiry or scruple, whether it had been offered to any idol or no. For the earth and all therein, are the good creature of the true God given by him to men for their use." (Locke vol. 8th.) If the Editor

still insists, in defiance of St. Paul's reference, of common sense, and of the above paraphrase, that in 1 Corinthians X. 26. St. Paul alludes to Jesus, I should take upon myself to refer him to Hebrews I. 2. (the son) "whom he (God) hath *appointed heir* of *all things*" and to John III. 35. "The father loveth the son and *hath given all things* into his hand." These I hope will convince him that all the power and possession of the son in heaven and on earth are derived from the gift of the father of the universe.

The Editor quotes 1 Corinthians X. 22. "Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than he"? whence he infers that "the Lord then is capable of being provoked by the worship of idols equally with God." Granting that St. Paul means Jesus by the term "Lord" and by the pronoun "he" in verse the 22nd, (a position which is unsupported by proof) we still find nothing in the passage elevating Jesus to equality with his Father. The Apostle may, according to the Editor's interpretation, be supposed to have prohibited Christians from provoking Christ to jealousy by partaking of the cup and table of devils, instead of those of Christ of which their master required them to partake, as ap-

pears from the immediately preceding verse — "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils." Is it not natural that Jesus, who enjoined the apostles to observe the Lord's supper, would be provoked to jealousy by his followers partaking both of his table and of the sacrifice offered to idols without his thereby equalizing himself with God? I find that the prophets of God are declared in more pointed terms to have been jealous of the dishonour manifested to God, but no one has ever felt disposed to ascribe to them equality with his divine majesty. 1 Kings XIX. 10. "And he said I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts; for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant and thrown down thy altars," &c.

I will repeat *verbatim* the Editor's quotation of Psalm XXIV. 8. and Eph. IV. 8. and his inference of the Deity of Jesus from the comparison of the one with the other, that my reader may perceive how violently prejudice can operate upon the human mind. He says (page 561.) that "in verse 8th one is about to enter heaven as the king of glory; who is called 'Jehovah,' mighty in battle." In Ephes. IV. "Jesus *elsewhere* styled the Lord

of glory ascends having led captivity captive, which implies battle and victory* Here also the son is either described as equal in might to Jehovah or as Jehovah himself." There are not in verse eighth nor in the whole Psalm XXIV. such phrases as "captivity captive" or "ascend on high" as found in Eph. IV. 8. nor are there in the whole Chapter IV. of Ephesians the terms "king of glory" or even "Lord of glory" or "mighty in battle" as we find stated in the above Psalm. The Psalm commences by a declaration of God's sovereignty over the earth—proceeds to state the virtues that must belong to those who seek his presence and desire his blessing—and concludes with an exhortation to Jerusalm to receive him as the king of glory—the Lord of Hosts. But the subject of the above verse of the Epistle to the Ephesians is Jesus, who ascended on high to give divine gifts to men, after he had *descended first into the middle of the grave*, as is evident from the immediately following verse; "now that he ascended, what is it, but that he also *descended* first *into the lower parts of the earth*" and so on;—a descent which cannot be ascribed to

* This term "to lead captivity captive" is not synonimous to "mighty in battle" nor equivalent in application. For one may be mighty in battle without leading captives; so one may lead captive by miraculous or artful means without being mighty in battle.

God. Verse the 8th of IV. Ephes. is an obvious reference to Psalm LXVIII. 18. a fact which is acknowledged even by Mr. Brown and Mr. Jones and many other Trinitarian writers. "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men; yea for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them." But the Editor omits here to compare the passage in Ephes. withthe last mentioned psalm, though both contain almost the same words that he dwells upon; perhaps in consideration of the latter phrases of the Psalm being inconsistent with his object. "Thou *hast received gifts* for men that *the Lord God might dwell among them*," which clearly show the subordination of the son to his heavenly father. In further explanation I repeat the note of Mr. Locke on verses 9. and 11. of Ephesians in his paraphrase of this Epistle, page 477. Note on verses 9—10. "St. Paul's argumentation, in these two verses, is skilfully adapted to the main design of his Epistle. The converted gentiles were attacked by the unconverted Jews, who were declared enemies to the thoughts of a Messiah that died. St. Paul, to enervate that objection of theirs, proves by the passage out of the Psalms v. 8 that he must die and be buried. Besides the unbe-

lieving Jews, several of them, that were converted to the Gospel, or at least professed to be so, attacked the gentile converts, on another ground persuading them, that they could not be admitted to be the people of God under the kingdom of the Messiah, nor receive any advantage by him, unless they were circumcised, and put themselves wholly under the Jewish constitution. He had said a greatdeal, in the three first chapters, to free them from this perplexity, but yet takes occasion here to offer them a new argument, by telling them, that Christ, the same Jesus that died, and was laid in his grave, was exalted to the right hand of God, above all the heavens, in the highest state of dignity and power, that, he himself being filled with the fulness of God, believers, who were all his members, might receive immediately from him, their head, a fulness of gifts and graces, upon no other terms, but barely as they were his members."

After having compared Psalm XXXVI. 6. "O Jehovah, thou preservest man and beast" with Col. I. 17. "By him (by Jesus) all things consist" and with Hebrews I. 3. "He upholds all things by the word of his power" the Editor thus concludes "the son then is either equal to Jehovah in preserving power; or Jeho-

vah himself." In the first place in some ancient manuscripts, instead of "by him all things consist" there is the phrase "all things are united in him" which of course bears no comparison with the above Psalm, "O Jehovah thou preservest man and beast." In the second place he may perceive from the context that by the term "all things" the apostle could have meant only the things concerning the Christian dispensation; For we find in the verse immediately following Jesus is declared to be "the head of the body, the church," and in the preceding verse* "the

* "That the apostle does not here intend the creation of natural substances is evident; for 1st, He does not say that by him were created heaven and earth, but things in heaven and things on earth: 2dly, He does not, in descending into detail, specify things themselves, viz: celestial and terrestrial substances, but merely states of things, viz: thrones, dominions &c. which are only ranks and orders of beings in the rational and moral world: 3dly, It is plain, from comparing ver. 15 and ver. 18, that Christ is called the first-born of the whole creation, because he is the first who was raised from the dead to an immortal life, 4thly, The creation of natural objects, the heaven, the earth and sea, and all things therein, when they are plainly and unequivocally mentioned, is uniformly and invariably ascribed to the father, both in the old Testament and the new. Hence it follows, that the creation which the apostle here ascribes to Christ, expresses that great change which was introduced into the moral world, and particularly into the relative situation of Jews and gentiles, by the dispensation of the gospel. This is often called creation, or the new creation, and is usually ascribed to Jesus Christ, who was the great prophet and messenger of the new covenant. See Eph. I. 10. II. 10—15. III. 9; IV. 24; Col. III. 10; 2 Cor. V. 17. This great change the apostle here describes under the symbol of a revolution introduced by Christ amongst certain ranks and orders of beings, by whom, according to the

things" are enumerated as orders and ranks in the religious and the moral world and not natural substances. In the third place admitting even the interpretation of the Editor that all natural substances consist by Jesus, we cannot help yielding conviction to the repeated avowal of Jesus manifesting that the support of all things, or the things of the new dispensation by Jesus is entirely owing to the power vested in him by the father of all things, without which he is totally unable to support them. John XVII. 2. Thou hast *given him* (the son) power over all flesh" Ch. V. 30. "I *can* of mine ownself *do nothing*" &c. As to the term "all things" *τα παντα* found in Heb. I. 3. just quoted by the Editor, it signifies also all the things belonging to the Christian dispensation as I observed before. But if the Editor again insists upon his mode of interpretation as meaning all natural objects by that term, he, by referring to John XIV. 24. "The *word* which ye hear *is not mine but the Father's*" and Matthew XXVIII. 18. "*all power is given unto me* in heaven and on earth" must be convinced that the word of power by which Jesus upholds or rules all things is in fact belonging to the father.

Jewish demonology, borrowed from the oriental philosophy, the affairs of states and individuals were superintended and governed. See Mr. Lindsey's Sequel, page 477, and Wetstein in loc." Improved version.

In his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus the Editor repeats (page 561.) Psalm XLV. 6. as quoted in Hebrews I. 8. "Thy throne O *Jehovah* is for ever and ever" My reader may observe that to apply to Jesus the term "Jehovah" the peculiar name of God, the Editor perverts the verse in question by placing the word "Jehovah" instead of "God" a term which is in the scriptures commonly used not only for the creator but for other superior existences. He at the same time neglects intirely the original psalm in Hebrew אלהים "Thy throne O God" and also the original epistle to Hebrews in Greek θεος "The throne of thee O God" I now beg to ask the Editor to let me know his authority for this unaccountable change. I should for my own part be indeed very sorry and ashamed of my opinions, if I found myself compelled to make perversions of scriptural passages and to set aside the suggestions of common sense to support the doctrines that I may have been persuaded to profess. It is again worth observing that the Editor quotes the above passage of Psalm XLV., omitting intirely to notice my remarks on it in the Second Appeal. I am therefore induced to repeat them, in the hope that he may reply to them and adopt a regular mode of argumentation. After stating that Moses

was also called God in scriptures I thus proceed. "On what principle then can any stress be laid in defence of the deity of the son in the prophetic expression quoted in Hebrews from Psalm XLV. 6. "Thy throne O God is for ever and ever" especially when we find in the very next verse words that declare his subordinate nature. "Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness, therefore God *thy God* hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above *thy fellows.* (Page 27) "But it deserves particularly to be noticed in this instance that the Messiah, in whatever sense he is declared God, is in the very same sense described in verse 7. ("God thy God") as having a God *superior to him,* and by whom he was appointed to the office of Messiah." (page 141.)

In the third place no scripturalist ever hesitated to apply Psalm XLV. directly to Solomon after his marriage with the daughter of Pharaoh as is evident from the context. "My heart is inditing a good matter: I speak of the things which I have made touching the King; my tongue *is* the pen of a ready writer. Thou art fairer than the children of men: grace is poured into thy lips: therefore God hath blessed thee for ever. Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom

is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. Kings' daughters *were* among thy honourable women: upon thy right hand did stand the queen in gold of Ophir. Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; forget also thine own people, and thy father's house: So shall the King greatly desire thy beauty; for he *is* thy Lord, and worship thou him. Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children, whom thou myest make princes in all the earth." If the application of the word "God" in an accommodated sense entitle Jesus to deity, how much more properly should the direct application of the same word "God" to Solomon, according to the Editor, exalt him to a participation in the divine nature.

The Editor afterwards quotes, in defence of the deity of Jesus, Psalm CII. 25—27. referred to by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews I. 10—12. "Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth and the heavens are the works of thy hand, they shall perish but thou remainest, and they all shall wax old as doth a garment and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up and they shall be

changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." The construction here admits of two interpretations; one is that verses 10, 11, and 12, are in continuation of verses 8, and 9th, addressed to the son by God as supposed by the Editor: the other is that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews invokes his divine majesty by quoting Psalm CII. 25—27. after he has, in the preceding verse introduced the name of God as anointing the son above his fellows, to shew the continual duration of the honour bestowed on the son as flowing from the unchangeable and preserving power of the bestower of that honor. To ascertain which of these two interpretations the Apostle had in view let us now refer to the context. One's exaltation above his fellows by another on account of his merit as stated in the preceding verse (9.) is quite inconsistent with the immutable character mentioned in verses 10—12. and therefore these two opposite qualities can by no means be ascribed to the same being. Again in the following verse, (13.) the apostle to prove the superiority of the son over angels asks "to which of the angels said he at any time, sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool."? Here common sense dictates that if such expressions as "thou

Lord in the begining hast laid the foundation of the earth &c. as a vesture shalt thou fold them up;" and "thou art the same and thy years shall not fail" had been meant by the apostle as applicable to Jesus, he would not in setting forth the dignity of the son, have added the words "Sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool," which imply a much inferior nature to that attributed in the preceding passage, and which indeed may be parallelled by other expressions found in scripture applied to *mere human* beings. Deut. XXXII. 10. "He (Jehovah) kept him as the *apple of his eye*" Isaiah XLIX. 16. "Behold I have graven thee upon *the palms of my hands*" Psalm XLVII. 3. "He (Jehovah) shall subdue the people under *us* and the nations under *our* feet" In describing the superior courage and strength of a man who is reported to have overpowered a lion and also a dog, no one endued with common sense would after stating the former fact, adduce the latter as an additional proof of courage and strength, as it is evident that to kill a dog is a feat by no means of so wonderful a nature as that of overcoming a lion. My reader may recollect Matthew XXII. 45. "If David then call him (the Messiah) Lord, how is he his son?" which tells us that Jesus disproves the assertion of the Mes-

siah being the son of David on the ground that no father could consistently call his son "Lord" much less could he apply to his son the term "my Lord." Were we to admit the first interpretation upheld by the Editor and to consider the passage "thou Lord in the beginning &c." as a part of the address of Jehovah to Jesus, we must, in conformity to the argument used by Jesus himself in Matthew XXII. 45. relinquish the commonly received doctrine that Jesus is the son of God, and actually admit his superiority to the father of the universe, who, according to the Editor, addresses him as "Lord" in Hebrews v. 10. Either therefore the Editor must abandon the opinion that God the father addresses Jesus as Lord, in the passage referred to, or he must cease to consider him as the "son of God."

The Editor again uses the word Jehovah in verse 10, and reads "Thou Jehovah in the beginning &c." instead of "Thou Lord in the begining &c." without assigning any reason for his deviating from the English version, as well as the Hebrew and Greek originals. For in the original Hebrew there is no "Jehovah" mentioned in Psalm CII. 25. and consequently in the Greek passage Hebrews I. 10. which is a quotation of the same verse of the above

Psalm the term κυριε cannot be supposed to be intended as a translation of the word Jehovah. So in the English version the verse stands thus "thou *Lord* in the begining" &c. I shall however feel obliged to the Revd. Editor, if he can point out to me any authority for his substitution of the word "Jehovah" for Lord in the verse in question.

With a view to weaken the strength of the evidence found in 1 Corinthians XV. 24. as to the changeable nature of Christ, the Editor says (page 562.) "His original throne as Jehovah God is for ever and ever; his mediatorial throne remains for a season and then ceases." I have already noticed in page 27 and 133 of the Second Appeal and in the foregoing chapter of this work that the term *for ever* or similar terms when used for a creature or a begotten son signify in scriptural idiom long duration of time. My reader therefore by referring to those instances will be convinced that neither Solomon to whom Psalm CII. 25. is directly applied, nor Jesus to whom the apostle applies the said verse in the above psalm in an accommodated sense, can be supposed to be endued with a throne or kingdom that never will cease; a question which St. Paul decides in the most plain and

positive terms in 1 Cor. XV. 24, 25. "Then cometh the end when he shall have *delivered up the kingdom* to God even the father, when he shall have laid down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet: (28.) And when all things shall be subdued unto him then shall the *son also himself* be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all" Here the apostle declares that Jesus will in the end *deliver up his kingdom* to God *the father* and not to God composed (as the Editor maintains) of the father, the son, and the Holy Ghost; and that the son himself, unlimited to any particular capacity whether meditorial, human or divine, shall be subject to the father, that God alone may be all in all. Is there in this passage or in any other part of the scriptures any authority for saying that the son's mediatorial throne *alone* shall be delivered up to the father? on the contrary neither he nor any one can in a mediatorial capacity exercise a kingdom; but Jesus as the king of our faith, the anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows, has a kingdom and throne, and that kingdom only can he deliver up in the end of the world that God may be all in all. Besides the above verse 28, asserts that he, as the *son*,

the highest title that Jesus is honored with, will be subject to him who has exalted him above all creatures. No one, besides, unbiassed by early prejudice, can ever venture to pronounce such an opinion as that a being can lose his kingdom in any capacity whatsoever and yet be unchangeable.

As some orthodox divines had attempted to prove the deity of Jesus from the circumstance of the term "shepherd" being applied to God in Psalm XXIII. and to Jesus in John X. 16. I pointed out (page 146 of the Second Appeal) that the same term "shepherd" is used for Moses (in Isaiah LXIII. 11. "with the shepherd of his flock") and for the leaders of Israel (Jerimiah XXIII. 4. "I will set up shepherds over them") yet that none of those persons is supposed to have been united with God.

The Revd. Editor altho' he acknowledges the accuracy of my above assertion yet tries to draw from it an argument against me by means of one or two strange questions, one is (page 562) "but did he (the author) never read of a chief shepherd, who when he shall appear will give the under shepherds a crown of glory?" The other is "But was our author ignorant that David was also one of Christ's fold, and

Moses and Abraham?" In answer to which I must confess that I am ignorant of David Moses and Abraham having been of Christ's fold; and although Jesus is styled "a chief shepherd" yet such avowal of his superiority above other messengers of the Deity neither places him on a level with Jehovah nor does it prove his unity with the most high God. Can a chief among the generals of a king be ever supposed equal to or identified with the king his employer? With respect to the argument founded on referring to Jesus Christ Ezek XXXIV. 23 "I will set one shepherd even my servant David", I observed in my Second Appeal (page 147.) that even in this case "they must still attribute his shepherdship over his flock to divine commission and must relinquish the idea of unity between God the employer and the Messiah his servant" to which the Editor makes reply, we must relinquish a unity of nature between the divine father and the Messiah whom he sent just as much as we do between Cyaxares, and Cyrus employed to lead his armies, between Vespassian and Titus, between George the Third and his son, now George the Fourth." In this passage it must be confessed that we have some thing like a clear definition or expression of the nature of the Trinity in which the Edi-

for professes his belief; that is he conceives the Godhead to constitute a genus like angel, man, fowl, fish &c. God the son being of the same nature with God the father just as the man George the Third is of the same nature with the man George the Fourth, though of a separate will, inclination, and passion, and distinct existence. A conception which is certainly compatible with an idea of unity of nature between the father and the son but which is entirely inconsistent with that of coevality between them; and implies that as the difference of existence &c between man and man is the origin of the plurality of mankind so, the difference of existence &c between God and God must cause plurality in the Godhead. Can there be any polytheistical creed more clear and more gross than this? Yet the Editor will take it amiss if charged with polytheism. It is worth observing that the orthodox so far from establishing the unity of the Messiah with God by means of the above passage, "I will set one shepherd over them even my *servant David*" can at most but prove unity between the Messiah and God's *servant David.*

In the course of this argument the Editor says that "he had adduced many other pas-

sages in which the son is called Jehovah." I wonder at this assertion: I find hitherto only two places in which he applies the word Jehovah to Jesus "thy throne O God!" &c. "And thou Lord in the beginning" &c. The Editor takes upon himself to use the term Jehovah instead of "God" in the former and instead of "Lord" in the latter instance, as before noticed, and now he gives out his own perversion of those texts as authority!

Mr. Jones having attempted to deduce the deity of Jesus by a comparison of Ephesians IV. 18. with Psalm LXVIII. 18. "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men, yea for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them". I observed (page 153 Second Appeal) that "from a view of the whole verse, the sense must, according to this mode of reasoning, be as follows. The person who ascended on high, and who *received* gifts for men, that the Lord God might dwell among them, is the Lord God; an interpretation which, as implying that the Lord God ascended, and received gifts from a being of course superior to himself, in order that he might dwell among men, is equally absurd and unscriptural" The Editor entirely omits to notice the forego-

ing observation and only refers to the context, inferring thence that different persons of the Godhead are addressed in the course of the Psalm. (page 564.) " The psalm he observes (LXVIII) commences with an address to God in the third person. At verse 7th he is addressed in the second person, the second person is retained till verse 11th and is resumed again in this the 18th verse. If one person be not addressed from the beginning, therefore, it is certain that he who ascended on high identified by Paul as Christ, is God who went forth before the people through the wilderness." How is it possible that the Editor, a diligent student of the Bible for thirty or forty years, should not know that in addressing God, the third person and also the second are constantly used in immediate sequence, and that this variation is considered a rhetorical trope in Hebrew and Arabic as well as in almost all the Asiatic languages from being supposed to convey notions of the omnipresence and pervading influence of the deity. To prove this assertion, I could quote a great many instances even from the single book of Psalms, such as Psalm 3—5. &c. and in a single ch. 2 Samuel XXII. 3. 49. in which God is addressed both in the second and third persons; but as the Editor might perhaps allege in those cases,

though in defiance both of the idiom of the Hebrew and of common sense, that in all these instances David in spirit meant the first and the second persons of the Godhead by the variety of persons; I shall quote the translation of some lines of the Qoran by Sale and of a Jewish prayer, in which the same variety of persons is used, and where it cannot be imagined that different persons of the Godhead are meant to be therein addressed. Alqoran ch. I. "Praise be *to God the Lord* of all creatures, the most merciful, the king of the day of judgment. *Thee* do we worship, and of thee do we beg assistance. Direct us in the right way in the way of those to whom thou hast been gracious, not of those against whom thou art incensed, not of those who go astray". Can Mohummud here be supposed to have alluded in spirit to the first and second persons of God, or has he not rather used those phrases according to the common practice of the language? The following lines are from a Jewish book of prayers written in Hebrew and translated into English.* "*Sabbath morning service.* 'Therefore all whom God hath formed, shall glorify and bless him; they shall ascribe praise, honor, and glory unto the king who hath

* Compiled by the Revd. Solomon Hirschell, translated by Messrs. Justins Barnet and Joseph, and printed in London by E. Justins 1803.

formed all things; and who through his holiness, causeth his people Israel to inherit rest on the holy sabbath. *Thy* name, O Lord our God! shall be sanctified." "*Morning service* ' His words also are living, permanent, faithful, and desirable for ever, even unto all ages, as well those which he hath spoken concerning our ancestors, as those concerning us, our children, our generations, and the generations of the seed of Israel, *thy* servants, both the first and the last." A thousand similar instances might be adduced.

In the Qoran it is further remarkable that the same change of person is adopted when God is represented as speaking of himself. Alqoran II. 5. "Set not up therefore any equals unto *God* against your own knowledge If ye be in doubt concerning that revelation, which *we* have sent down unto our servant, produce a chapter like unto it and call upon your witnesses besides *God*, if ye say truth." Moreover we find in the Jewish scriptures that in speaking of a third party both the second and the third personal pronouns are sometimes used Hosea II. 15—17. And I will give her her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope; and she shall sing there as in the days of her

youth, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt. "And it shall be at that day saith the Lord, *that* thou shalt call me Ishi, and shalt call me no more Baali." "For I will take away the manes of Baalim out of her mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by their name." (19) "And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercies." The public may now judge what weight the argument of the Editor ought to carry with it; and whether I adduced only a "Jewish dream" in applying verse 18 originally to Moses or whether the Editor rather has not founded his position on the ground of mere imagination. To me, as an Asiatic, nothing can appear more strange than an attempt to deduce the deity of Jesus from an address by David to the omnipresent God couched in both the second and third persons. I will moreover confidently appeal to the context to satisfy any unprejudiced person that the Psalmist in verse 18th had Moses alone in view. The Psalm it will be recollected was written on the specific occasion of the removal of the ark, which was done according to the instructions delivered to Moses by God on mount Sinai. David accordingly reca-

pitulates in the preceding verses of the Psalm the wonderful mercies of God in delivering Israel from the Egyptians and leading them towards the promised land. In the 15, 16, and 17th verses Sinai is thus mentioned. "The hill of God is as the hill of Bashan; an high hill as the hill of Bashan. Why leap ye, ye high hills, this is the hill which God desireth to dwell in: yea, the Lord will dwell in it for ever. The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place." In verse 18 immediately after mention of the word Sinai the holy place he goes on, thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: Thou hast *received gifts* for men; yea for the rebellions also; *that the Lord God might dwell among them*;—the very reason to which in the Book of Exodus the construction of the ark, whose removal was taking place, is assigned. From this it appears evident that the gifts alluded to were those granted on mount Sinai; and the only question that remains is who was it that received those gifts for men? I leave this to be answered by the candid reader. There are besides many other passages in the writings of the psalmist where David after addressing the supreme father of the universe, abruptly addresses himself to

creatures, such as in Psalms LXVIII. 28. Psalm IV. 1, and 2. Psalm IX 5, 6, 10 and 11. Psalm LXVI. 15, 16. Psalm XCI. 13 and 14. There is nothing therefore unusual or strange in applying the verse in question, though originally relating to Moses, in an accommodated sense to Jesus.

To prove the figurative application of the term God to Jesus and to other superior creatures from the authority of the saviour himself I quoted (Second Appeal page 25) John X. 34. "Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are Gods?" With a view to invalidate this argument the Editor puts three questions (page 564) the first is "what creatures of a superior nature are here termed Gods? Those that die like men." To this I answer, yes: the term "God" is here applied to those chiefs of Israel who were men, and who consequently died like men: and from the very circumstance of their having had the appearance of man and having been endowed with human feelings, as well as their having been like men, liable to death, we are under the necessity of inferring that the application of the term "God" to them is figurative and that it is by no means real; though we find them exalted by the terms "the sons of the

most high," (Psalm LXXXII. 6.*) "the first born of God," (Exodus IV. 22.) the "peculiar people of God above all nations," (XIX. 5.) the "kingdom of priests and holy nation" (6) and even by the most glorifying title of "Gods" (Psalm LXXXII. 6.) Upon the same ground and the same principle, we must consider (if not biassed by prejudice) the use of the word "God" and "the son of God" for Jesus to be figurative, as he himself explained (John X. 34) for, although Jesus was honored with abundantly high titles, yet he was in the appearance of man and possessed of human feelings and liable to death like those chiefs of Israel, as is evident from the following as well as many other facts recorded in the scriptures. "She brought forth her first born son" (Jesus) (Luke II. 7.) "And when *eight days* were accomplished for *circumcising* of the *child* his name was called Jesus" (21.) "And the child *grew* and waxed *strong* in spirit, filled with wisdom, and *the grace of God* was *upon him*" (40) "When he was *twelve years old*" (42) "And was subject unto them" (his parents) (51) "Jesus increased in wisdom and *stature*" (52) "The son of man came *eating* and *drinking*" &c (Matt. XI. 19) "And when he had looked

* In the original Hebrew the word בני signifying sons is found instead of ילדי or children as found in the English version.

round about on them with *anger* being *grieved*" (Mark III. 5) "Jesus therefore being *weary* with his journey" (John IV. 6) "Now is my *soul troubled*" XII. 27. "And began to wash his disciple's feet" XIII. 5. "He was *troubled in spirit*" (21) "and being in an *agony*, he *prayed more earnestly* (Luke XXII. 44) "And (Jesus) saith unto them *my soul* is exceedingly *sorrowful unto death*" Mark XIV. 34. "Jesus when he had *cried again* with a loud voice *yielded up the ghost*" (Matt. XXVII. 50) Philippians II. 8. "And became *obedient unto death* even the death of the cross." Ought not the consideration of the foregoing circumstances relating to Jesus Christ to have prevented the Editor from inquiring "what creatures of a superior nature are here termed Gods. Those (Israelites) that die like men"? For, if the cricumstance of being men and dying like men must preclude the chiefs of Israel from being supposed to be creatures of a superior nature, notwithstanding they are called *Gods*, the highest of all the honorary terms with which any being can be exalted, how can the same argument fail of proving the common humanity of Jesus, who was like them in the shape of a man and died as a man? If the Editor say that Jesus though he died like man, yet was raised again from the dead, I

shall remind him that Enoch, one of the sons of men, and Elijah, a Jewish prophet, never tasted death at all like other men*; that the dead who happened to touch the body of Elisha revived and stood up†; and that a dead boy also was raised by him‡; and then ask the Editor, are not these circumstances more wonderful than Christ's being raised after death? Is not the fact of Elijah's not having died at all more conclusive evidence of a superior nature, according to the mode of reasoning employed by the Editor, than the resurrection of Christ after his death on the cross?

In case the Editor should have recourse to the generally adopted argument that Jesus was possessed of a two fold nature, the nature of God and the nature of man; the former because he is termed God in scripture, and the later because he was in the shape of man; I would ask, Is there any authority in the sacred writings for alleging that Jesus was possessed of such two fold nature? A question which indeed I took upon myself to put to the Editor in the Second Appeal (page 103.) but which he has avoided to answer. Are not Moses and the chiefs of Israel termed in like manner Gods‖

* 2 Kings II. 11. † 2 Kings XIII. 21. ‡ 2 Kings IV. 34, 35.
‖ Exo. VII. 1.

as well as men*? Did not they perform wonderful miracles, as raising the dead and commanding wind and water† as well as the sun and moon‡? Did not some of them talk of themselves in a manner suitable to the nature of God alone‖? Are we from these circumstances to represent them as possessing a twofold nature divine and human? If not, let us give up such an unscriptural and irrational idea as attributing to Jesus or to any human being a double nature of God and man, and restrain ourselves from bringing Christianity to a level with the doctrines of heathenish polytheism. Is it not a general rule adopted to preserve concordance between all the passages of scripture and to render them consistent with reason, that when terms, phrases, or circumstances, which are applicable to God alone, are found ascribed to a created being either man or angel, these are to be interpreted in an inferior sense? Were we to deviate from this general rule and take these terms to be real, Judaism and Christianity would be but systems of polytheism and unworthy of adoption by rational beings. Such an attempt as to shew that Moses and the chiefs of Israel having been types and shadows of Jesus, are

* Deut. XXXIII. 1. Ezkeil XXXIV. 31.

† 1 Kings XVII. 1. XVIII. 44. 45. and 2 Kings II. 22.

‡ Joshua X. 12, and 13. ‖ Deut. XXVII. 1. XXXII. 1.

called gods is totally inadmissible; for, we find no authority in the scriptures for such an assertion: moreover had there been any authority declaring Moses and others to have been types of Jesus, it could not depreciate the honor which scripture confers upon them by the application of the terms "gods" and "sons of God" to them, any more than the fact that Christ was the Saviour of mankind in consequence of his having been of the seed of Abraham* and house of David, as well as the rod of the stem of Jesse†, could lower the dignity of the Messiah, or could exalt the rank of Abraham or of David above Christ.

Such an apology as ascribes birth, growth and death, to the material body of Christ, and immortality and divinity to his spirit, is equally applicable to those Israelites that are termed gods.

The second question of the Editor is "to whose nature is their's (Israel's) superior? only to that of the brutes!" In answer to which I refer the Editor to the passages already cited to wit, Psalm LXXXII. 6. Exod. IV. 22. XIX. 5 and 6. as well as to Exod. XXV. 8. "God was dwelling among them," Deut VII. 6.

* Genesis XXII. 18. † Isaiah XI. 1.

"that he has chosen them from all the nations." X. 15. "He loved them, he chosed them only" XIV. 1. "they are the sons of God" and to numerous passages of a similar description, whence the Editor may judge whether Israel was superior to the brutes only or to the rest of mankind. The third question is "if other gods die like men, must Jehovah, who made heaven and earth whose throne is for ever"? My answer must be in the negative, because Jehovah is not a a man-god that shall die; but he, as the God of all gods and the Lord of lords, must regulate the death and birth of those who are figuratively called gods, while he himself is immutable. Deut. X. 17. "Jehovah your God is God of gods and Lord of lords" John XX. 17. "To my God and your God" Psalm XLV. 8. "God thy God hath anointed thee" Let us now again refer to the context of John X. 34. In v. 33. the Jews assign it as the reason for their attempting to stone Jesus that he made himself equal to God by* calling himself the son of God, as they supposed in a real sense, which was according to their law blasphemy: Jesus therefore pointed out to them in v. 34. that even the term "god" is found figuratively applied to the chiefs

* As is evident from the reply of Jesus v. 36. "Thou blasphemest, because I said I am the son of God."

of Israel in scripture without meaning to imply thereby their equality with God; in v. 35. he reminds them of their applying, according to the scriptures, the same divine term to those chiefs; and lastly he shews their inconsistency in calling their chiefs gods and at the same time rejecting Christ's declaration of his being the son of God, in the same metaphorical sense, as being "sanctified" and "sent" by God. Is not this argument used by Jesus an evident disavowal of his own deity and manifestation of his having called himself "the son of God" only in a metaphorical sense? I am sorry to observe that the Editor seems to have bestowed little or no reflection upon these texts.

In answer to my observation on the attempt of othodox Christians to prove the deity of Jesus from 1 Cor. X. 9. "Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted," the Editor quotes first an observation of my own, to wit, "how far cannot prejudice carry away men of sense? Are we not all in common with Jesus liable to be tempted both by men and Satan? Can the liability to temptation common to God, to Jesus, to Abraham, and all mankind, be of any avail to prove the divinity and unity of those respective subjects of temp-

tation?; he then declares that I was not correct in the statement of my opponent's doctrine on this subject, and denies any one's "having attempted to prove the deity of Christ merely from his being tempted." To shew the accuracy of my statement however, I beg to refer the Editor to Mr. Jones's work on the nature of Christ. The Editor lastly asserts that "it is the apostle's declaring that Christ was he who was tempted in the wilderness, and hence the most high God described by the Psalmist as tempted, which is here adduced." But I do not find in the verse in question nor in any preceding or following verse "the apostle declaring that Christ was he who was tempted *by Israel* in the wilderness." If the Editor has met with such a declaration elsewhere, he should first point it out and then build his argument upon it. But unless he first shew that being tempted by the devil and being tempted by Israel mean the same thing, I cannot admit any relation between the declaration of the apostles and that of the Psalmist.

Relative to Psalm CX. "the Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool," I observed, in my Second Appeal (page 122.) that this passage is simply applied to the Messiah, ma-

nifesting that the victory gained by him over his enemies was entirely owing to the influence of God!" To this the Editor replies "after the son had humbled himself so as to assume our nature and be appointed to the combat, it was not to be expected that the father would *forsake him*. But that Jesus had no might of his own, which our author would fain prove, is not a fact." Is it not most strange that the son, whom the Editor considers the *immutable, almighty* God, should be supposed by him again to have *humbled* himself and to have been *appointed* by another to a combat in which that other assisted him to obtain success? Are not these two ideas quite incompatible with each other? If such positive disavowal of his *own* power by Jesus himself as "I can of mine ownself do nothing," "all that the father giveth shall come to me," has failed to convince the Editor that Jesus had no power of *his own*, no argument of mine or of any other human being can be expected to make an impression upon him.

The Editor afterwards endeavours to prove the omnipotence of Jesus by quoting Isaiah LXIII. 5. "Mine own arm brought salvation unto me" and Rev. I. 8. "I am alpha and omega; the beginning and the end

saith the Lord which is, and which was, and which is to come, the almighty." Supposing these two last mentioned passages to be actually ascribed to Jesus, conveying a manifestation of his own omnipotence, would they not be esteemed as directly contradictory to his positive disavowal of omnipotence found in the foregoing and in hundreds of other passages? How then are we to reconcile to our understanding the idea that the author of true religion disavows his almighty power on one occasion and asserts it on another? But in fact we are not reduced by the texts in question to any such dilemma, for the passage quoted from Isaiah (LXIII.) has no more allusion to Jesus than to Moses or Joshua: whence and under what plea the Editor and others apply this passage to Christ I am quite at a loss to know. The prophet here speaks of the destruction of Edom and Bozrah, under the wrath of God, for their infidelity towards Israel. These places were inhabited by the sons of Esau (the brother of Jacob) who was also called Edom: Genesis XXV. 30. "And Esau said to Jacob, feed me, I pray thee, with that same red pottage, for I am faint: therefore was his name called Edom." So Jeremiah prophesies the destruction of Edom and Bozrah XLIX. 7. "concerning Edom,

thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Is wisdom no more in Teman? Is council perished from the prudent? Is their wisdom vanished? Flee ye, turn back, dwell deep, O inhabitants of Dedan; for I will bring the calamity of Esau upon him the time that I will visit him (13.) For I have sworn by myself saith the Lord, that Bozrah shall become a desolation, a reproach, a waste and a curse, and all the cities thereof shall be perpetual wastes." And also the whole of Obadiah's prophecy foretels the slaughter of Edom by the wrath of God. I quote here only one or two verses (8) "Shall I not in that day saith the Lord even destroy the wise men out of Edom and understanding out of the mount of Esau? (9.) And thy mighty men, O Teman shall be dismayed to the end that every one of the mount of Esau may be cut off by slaughter" (11.) "In the day that thou stoodest on the other side; in the day that the strangers carried away captive his forces, and foriguers entered into his gate and cast lots upon Jerusalem even thou wast as one of them." What expression does Isaiah make use of in ch. LXIII. that the passage can be interpreted as speaking the language of Jesus? nothing of the kind that I can perceive. It contains rather such denunciations as are considered totally inconsistent

with the office and character of the meek and lowly Jesus, the messenger of peace on earth and good will in heaven towards men. Can the following expressions "I will tread them in my anger,"–"their blood shall be upon my garment," (v. 3.) be ascribed to Jesus, who so far from treading down the inhabitants of Edom and Bozrah, or of any other land, and sprinkling their blood upon his garment, came to reconcile them to God, and labored in behalf of them and of all men; even suffering his own blood to be shed rather than refrain from teaching them the way of salvation? What particular connection had Jesus with the destruction of the sons of the children of Edom to justify the Editor in referring ch. LXIII. to the Messiah? I should expect to find such language as is used by Isaiah in that chapter referring to God; for in the poetical language of the Prophets similar expressions are abundantly ascribed to the Most High in an allegorical sense. Isaiah LIX. 15—17. "And the Lord saw it and it displeased him that there was no judgement. And he saw that there was *no man* and wondered that there was no *intercessor:* therefore his arm *brought salvation unto him* and his righteousness it sustained him. For he put on righteousness as a breast plate and an helmet of salvation upon his head; and he

put on the *garments of vengeance* for clothing and was clad with zeal as a cloak" Daniel VII. 9. "I beheld till the thrones were cast down and the ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow."

As to Revelation I. 8. let us refer to the contexts, commencing with v. 4th. In this John addressing the seven churches of Asia says "Grace be unto you and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come: *and* from the seven spirits which are before his throne; *and* from Jesus Christ." He proceeds to describe Christ as a faithful witness, the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth, adding "unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him even so. Amen." Having thus stated what Christ had done and is to do, John reverts to the declaration of the eternity of God with which he commenced "I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord; which is, and which was,

and which is to come, the almighty." All this appears so very plain; the eternal attributes of the almighty in verse 4th. are so distinct from the description of the character and office of Christ in verses 5, 6 and 7, the identity of the definition of God in v. 4. with that in v. 8. is so obvious, that I should have thought it impossible for any not to perceive how totally unconnected v. 8. is with that which precedes it, and how far it was from John's intention to declare the almighty and his faithful witness to be one. Moreover we find the term "almighty" in the book of Revelation mentioned seven times besides in verse the 8th and referring *always* to God; at the same time notwithstanding the frequent mention of the Lamb or Jesus throughout the whole book neither the term "almighty" nor the designation "who is and who was and is to come" equivalent to the term "Jehovah" is *once* ascribed to the Lamb. Let the candid reader judge for himself.

The Editor again introduces the subject of the angel of Bokim (page 565.) quoting Psalm LXXVIII. "He divided the sea and caused them to pass through and made the waters to stand in a heap" &c. Whence he concludes that the son was with Israel in the

wilderness as their God. But what allusion this Psalm has to Christ, situated either in the wilderness or in an inhabited land, my limited understanding is unable to discover. As I have already noticed the argument adduced by the Editor respecting angels, in the begining of this chapter, I will not renew the subject, but beg my reader's attention to that part of my treatise.

The Editor quotes Psalm XCV. " For Jehovah is a great God and a great king above all Gods. O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before Jehovah our maker, for he is our God and we are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hand"; and justifies the application of this passage to Jesus upon the ground that in John I. 3. Jesus is declared equally with the Father to be the maker of all things. I wonder at the Editor's choosing this passage as being applicable to Jesus on such a basis; for should this reason be admitted as well founded, all the passages of the Old Testament in which Jehovah is mentioned, would be interpreted as referring to Jesus without selection. As I noticed this verse of John I. 3. and one or two similar verses in page 110, I will not recur to them here.

Having also noticed Psalm II. (page 103.) "Blessed are all they who trust in him" I will abstain from reiterating the same subject though I find the Editor repeating his arguments here in his usual manner.

To my great surprise I observe that the Editor again quotes John X. 30. "I and my father are one," to shew that God and Jesus though they are two beings yet are one, without any attention to all the illustrations I adduced to explain this passage in the Second Appeal. (page 19.) I will however elucidate this passage still more fully in its proper place. I thank the Revd. Editor for quoting such passages as Psalms LXXXI. 9, 10. and LXXXIII. 18. which in common with all other authorities of the sacred books decidedly prove the unity of the Supreme Being, and that no other being except him is worthy to be called Jehovah.

In the course of the quotation from the Psalms the Editor cites Heb. III 3 4. "For this man is counted worthy of more glory than Moses, in as much as he who hath builded the house is worthy of more honor than the house. For every house is built by some man; But he who built all things is God." Upon which he

comments that it was Christ that built the house understood, (as he supposes) from the phrase "all things" in the verse in question. I will not prolong the discussion by pointing out the errors appearing in the English version. I only repeat verse the 6th explaining what the apostle meant by the house of Christ, which the Editor omitted to mention; to wit. "But Christ as a *son over his own house whose house are we.*" Hence it is evident that the house which Christ built by the will of the Father is the Christian church; and that God the Father of Jesus and of the rest of the universe is the author of all things whatsoever.

Section II.

The Prophets.

In introducing the prophets the Revd. Editor commences with Proverbs saying. "If in this book Christ be represented under the character of wisdom, as divines have thought, and as seems implied in Christ's saying, Matt. XI. 49. "But wisdom is justified of her children," and Luke XI. 19. "Therefore said the wisdom of God I will send them prophets,"

fresh proof is here furnished to the eternal deity of the son." He then quotes Proverbs VIII. 1. 22. 24. 30. "Doth not wisdom cry—, the Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way before his works of old. When he prepared the heavens I was there—, I was by him as one brought up* with him—, I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him." It is indeed astonishing to me how the strong prejudice of other learned divines as well as of the Editor in favor of the doctrine of the trinity, has prevented them from perceiving that the identification attempted to be thus deduced by them from those passages of the book of Proverbs instead of proving the "eternal deity" of Jesus or his self-existence, would go to destroy his distinct existence altogether; for Christians of all denominations agree that *wisdom, understanding*, and all other attributes of God have been from eternity to eternity in the *possession* of the almighty power, without either or any of them having been endowed with a separate existence; and were we to attribute to each of the properties of God selfexistence, we must necessarily admit that there are besides God numerous beings (his attributes) which possess, like God

* אמון in the original Hebrew does not signify "brought up." It means "steaded" stabled or established as qualities with substances. See Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon.

himself, eternal existence; a doctrine which would amount to gross polytheism. But the expression "the Lord *possessed* me in the begining of his way" (v. 22. quoted by the Editor) proves that the wisdom there alluded to was considered as *in possession* of Jehovah just as his other attributes are. If Jesus then be meant here by wisdom, he must, so far from being esteemed as Jehovah himself, be supposed to have been *possessed by Jehovah* as an attribute. If this doctrine be admitted as orthodox, how then are the primitive Christians to be justified in condemning Sabellius on account of his maintaining the same doctrine? We find that consistently with the same prophetical language the inspired writer of Proverbs directs us to call wisdom *a sister* and understanding *kins-woman* (VII. 4.) instead of bestowing on her such epithets as Jehovah, the everlasting God, that are insisted upon by the Editor as properly applied to Jesus. In fact the book of Proverbs meant only to urge in the usual poetical style of expression, the necessity of adhering to wisdom both in religious and social life, strengthening the exhortation by pointing out that all the works of God are founded upon wisdom. If such poetical personifications as are found in the Prophets, as well as in profane Asiatic works in

common circulation, were to be noticed, a separate voluminous work would I am afraid fail to contain them. And if the abstract attributes of God such as wisdom, mercy, truth, benevolence, &c. are to be esteemed as separate deities, on account of their being sometimes personified and declared eternal and associating with God, this mode of literal interpretation would, I admit, be so far advantageous to the cause of the Editor as respects the refutation of the doctrine of the unity of God, but would not be precisely favorable to the doctrine of the trinity, as it would certainly extend the number of personified deities much beyond three. Take for example the following passages which personify the attributes of God and ascribe to them eternity and association with God. Psalm CXXX. 7. "With the Lord there is mercy and with him is plenteous redemption" LXXXV. 10. "Mercy and truth are *met* together righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Number XVI. 46. "There is wrath gone out from the Lord." Here we have mercy, redemption, truth, and wrath all spoken of as separate existences. Are we therefore to consider them as persons of the Godhead? As abstract qualities are often represented in the scriptures and in Asiatic writings generally, as persons and agents to render ideas

familiar to the understanding, so real existences are intended sometimes under the appellation of abstract qualities for the sake of energy of expression. In 1 John IV. 8. God is declared to be mere *Love*. John I. 1. Jesus is called word or revelation; 1 Cor. I. 24. and 30. Christ is represented as power and wisdom &c. 11 Cor. V. 21. true Christians are declared to be wisdom in Christ. and Israel is said to be an *astonishment* in Deut. XXVIII. 37, and *curse* in Zech. VIII 13. Abraham to be *blessing* in Genesis. XII. 2. and Jehovah is declared to be *glory* in Zech. II. 5. But every unprejudiced mind is convinced that these allegorical terms neither can alter the fact nor can they change the nature of the unity of God and of the dependence of his attributes.

After this no further remark seems necessary on the passages quoted by the Editor from Matthew and Luke—where, as in many other passages in which the word wisdom is to be found, the sense neither requires nor even admits of our understanding Jesus to be meant under that appellation.

The Editor quotes Isaiah VI. 1. 10. relating to the Prophet's vision of God: He then com-

ments "as this glorious vision wherein the Prophet received his commission, represented either the father or the son, we might have expected that it should be the son, who had undertaken to redeem men." The Editor afterwards quotes John XII. 41. "these things said Isaiah when he saw his glory and spoke of him," and considers these words as decisive testimony of the opinion that it was the son who was seen by the Prophet in the vision.

Let us first impartially refer to the context of verse 41. of John. We find in the verse a personal pronoun used three times. The first "he" in the phrase "when he saw" though understood in the Greek verb "εἶδε"; the second "his" connected with the word "glory;" and the third "of him" after the verb "spoke"—thus—"when *he* saw *his* glory and spoke *of him*. The first pronoun "he" of course refers to Isaiah mentioned just before it. The second and the third "his" and "of him" can have no reference to Isaiah, for the words "when Isaiah saw Isaiah's glory and spoke of Isaiah, could bear no sense whatever. These two last pronouns must therefore have reference to some pronoun or noun to be found in the immediately preceding part of the passage. We accordingly find from the preceding verse (40.) that

these pronouns refer to Jehovah the God of hosts mentioned twice in verse 38. whose glory Isaiah saw and in whose behalf he spoke, without mention of the son being once made between verse 38 and 41. the passage thus stands(v. 38.) He(Isaiah) spoke *Lord* who hath believed our report and to whom hath the arm of the *Lord* been revealed ? (39.) Therefore they could not believe that Isaiah said again (40.) *He* hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart ; (41.) These things said Isaiah when he saw *his* glory and spoke *of him.* Isaiah must have then seen the glory of him in whose behalf he spoke ; a fact which neither party can dispute : and as it is evident from the preceding verse (40.) and from Isaiah VI. that he spoke of God who *blinded* the *eyes* of the Jews and *hardened* their hearts, it necessarily follows that he saw the glory of that very being spoken of by Isaiah. For further illustration of God's being often declared to have blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, I quote Romans XII. 7 and 8. " What then ? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for ; but the election hath obtained it and the rest were *blinded.* According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber ; *eyes* that they should *not see* and *ears* that they should not *hear* unto this day." Isaiah LXIII. 17.

"O Lord, why hast thou made us to err from thy ways *and hardened* our heart from thy fear: Return for thy servants' sake, the tribe of thy inheritance." From v. the 38 to 41. as already observed is not a single noun or a pronoun that can have allusion to Jesus. But we find in verse 42. the pronoun "him" implying the son as absolutely required by the sense, in reference to verse 37. and in consistence with verse 44. in which the name of Jesus is found mentioned. As all the Pharisees believed in God as well as in Isaiah one of their prophets, the text could convey no meaning, if the phrase "nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed in him" were admitted to bear reference either to God or Isaiah.

If it be insisted upon in defiance of all the foregoing explanation that the two last mentioned pronouns in verse 41. "when he saw his glory and spoke of him" are applied to Jesus, the passage in the evangelist would be in that case more correctly explained by referring it to John VIII. 56. "your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day," which cannot be understood of ocular vision but prophetic anticipation; whereas the glory seen in the vision of Isaiah was that of God himself in the deli-

very of the command given to the prophet on that occasion as I observed in the Second Appeal (page 142.) With a view to invalidate this interpretation the Editor inquires (page 569.) What has Abraham's day to do with Isaiah's vision?" In answer to which I must allow that Abraham's day had nothing to do with Isaiah's vision except that as Abraham saw the day of Christ, (properly speaking the reign of Christ) by prophetic anticipation and not through ocular vision (John VIII. 56.) so Isaiah as another prophet of God must have seen the glory of Christ (if he had seen it at all) through the same prophetic anticipation, and must have spoken of Christ's commission (if he had spoken of him at all) through the same prophetic power: the reference therefore is one which goes to prove that whenever the prophets such as Abraham, Isaiah, or any other prophets are declared to have seen or spoken of future events, they must have seen or spoken of them through the prophetic power vested in them by God. I never attempted to prove that the words "day" and "glory" are synonimous, nor did I declare that Isaiah saw the day of Christ, that the Editor should have occasion to advance that "it is not the day of Christ which the Evangelist describes Isaiah as having seen but his glory."

However I cannot help being of opinion that in such phrases on particular occasions as "he saw the day of the king Messiah" or "he saw the glory of the king Messiah" the words "day" and "glory" amount almost to the same thing. My limited understanding cannot like the Editor's discover how "Isaiah fixes the time when he thus saw Christ's glory, even when it was said "he hath blinded their eyes" &c. for I find the Jews were from time to time charged by several of the prophets with disobedience and with having been blinded and hardened. Deut. XXVIII. 28. "The Lord shall smite thee with madness and *blindness* and astonishment of heart XXIX. 4. The Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive and *eyes to see* and ears to hear unto this day" 1 King *XVIII.* 37. "Hear me; O Lord, hear me that this people may know that thou act the Lord God and that thou hast *turned their heart back again.*" Isaiah LXIII. 17. as noticed before.

The Editor refers to the prophet Isaiah (533. and 570.) saying that Isaiah in ch. VII "predicting the birth of Christ identifies his divine and his human nature, "behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son and shall call his name Immanuel," This passage the holy spirit ap-

plies to Christ in Matthew I. 22 and 23. He regrets my applying the above verse to Hezekiah in an immediate sense, though totally unable to reject the proof of such application deduced by me in my Second Appeal from its context and from the sacred history. He rests his rejection entirely upon the phrase "A virgin shall conceive" found in the English version as being used in the future tense, on the ground that "Hezekiah could not have been the child at the time about to be conceived by the virgin, for this plain reason that God never foretels past things. The birth of Hezekiah was not then a thing to come; for, he was at least six years old when this prophecy was spoken.—This our author will see by merely comparing the fact that Ahaz reigned sixteen years and Hezekiah began to reign when he was five and twenty years old. Hezekiah must then have been six if not seven years old when this prophecy was delivered." The Editor then charges me with having expended in vain 12 pages on this as well as on the passage in ch. IX. of Isaiah. Here we find again a new instance in which a diligent study of the Bible for thirty or forty years but accompanied with early religious prejudices has not been able to save the student from making such an error as to take the

term הרה "pregnant" in the original verse in Hebrew as meaning absolutely "shall conceive," and to declare unthinkingly that "Hezekiah could not have been the child at that time to be conceived." How will the Editor render the same term "הרה" found in Genesis XVI. 11. "Thou hast conceived or art with child." Will he on his adopted principle interpret it "thou shalt conceive"? He must in that case overlook verses 4th. and 5th. of the same chapter which testify Hagar's having already conceived before the angel of the Lord had seen and spoken to her in verse the 11th. "He went in unto Hagar and she conceived and when she saw she had conceived &c. (4) And Sarai said unto Abraham "My wrong be upon thee: I have given my maid unto thy bosom, and when she saw that she had conceived &c" (5.) Did not the Editor ever reflect upon Jeremiah XXXI. 8. containing the same terms "הרה" or "pregnant" and "יולדת" or "bearing" as are found in Isaiah VII. 14. ?—; a passage which might have suggested to the Editor the propriety of not making so positive an assertion that "Hezekiah could not have been the child at that time to be conceived." Did the Editor entirely overlook the same term "הרה" signifying pregnant in 2d Samuel XI. 5. and Isaiah XXVI. 17. Genesis XXXVIII. 24.

25. Exodus XXI. 22. 2d Kings VIII. 12. Amos. I. 13. The fact is that we find in the original Hebrew "העלמה" signifying "the virgin" which, if not referred to a particular person before mentioned, implies in the figurative language of the scripture either a city or the people of a city, as I noticed in page 128, 129, and 136. of my Second Appeal; and also we find "הרה" synonimous with the participle "conceived" instead of "shall conceive." The verse therefore thus runs; "Behold the virgin (the city of Jerusalem or the nation) is pregnant and is bearing a son and shall call his name Immanuel" (14.) For before the child* shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good the land that thou (Ahaz) abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings" (15) i.e. Rezin the king of Syria and Pekah the king of Israel, who at that time had besieged Jerusalèm; as is evident from the preceding verses; and such personifying phrases as "oppressed virgin" and "bring forth children" are found also applied to the city or the peo-

* In the 17th. year of the reign of Pekah the king of Israel Ahaz was born, and twenty years old was Ahaz when he began to reign in Jerusalem and he reigned sixteen years 2 Kings XVI. 1 and 2. Hence it appears that he lived thirty-six years only and as Hezekiah began to reign after the death of his father Ahaz when he was twenty and five years old (2 Kings XVIII. 2.) he must have been born when his father Ahaz was ten or at most eleven years of age which was rather contrary to the common course of nature.

ple of the city in the prophets in other instances similar to that of Isaiah VII. 14. in question Micah IV. 10. "Be *in pain* and *labour to bring forth, O daughter of Zion*, like a woman in travail. Isaiah XXIII. 12. "And he said, thou shalt no more rejoice, O thou oppressed virgin daughter of Zion." But unless orthodox authors changed "the virgin" into "a virgin" and "conceived" into "shall conceive" they could not apply the verse in a direct sense to Mary the mother of Christ and to Christ himself; and consequently to suit their convenience they have entirely disregarded the original scripture, the context, and the historical facts.

In noticing my explanation of the *העלמה "the virgin" in the Second Appeal, the Rev. Editor states that "It is true ה the emphatic of Hebrew is generally rendered in the septuagint by the Greek article; that they are by no means equivalent in value however he may convince himself by referring to that excellent work on the Greek article for which the learned world is indebted to Dr. Middleton the bishop of Calcutta." I am really sorry to observe that the Editor should have given such

* In Isaiah LII. 2. The city or the people of the city is once called "a captive daughter;" In ch LIV. 1. it is once styled "barren" עקרה; "a harlot" in Ezekiel XVI 35. and in other instances,

an evasive answer to so important a point; He however was obliged to do so, knowing that ה in Hebrew before a noun as ل in Arabic is invariably a definite article. In his attempt to remove the inconsistency between his maintaining the idea of the deity of Jesus and applying to him verses 15. and 16. in Isaiah VII. by which he is declared subject to total ignorance, the Rev. Editor attributes (534.) such ignorance to the human nature of Jesus, forgetting what, he in common with other orthodox Christians, offers as an explanation of such passages as declare all power in Heaven and earth to have been given to Jesus by the father of the universe; which is that all power was given him in his human capacity while in his divine capacity he enjoys independent omnipotence. Is not the power of distinguishing good from evil included in all power *given* to Jesus, according to the Editor in his *human* capacity? How then can the Editor be justified in maintaning the idea that in his human nature he, though possessed of all power in heaven and earth, was unable before the age of maturity to distinguish the good from the evil, as found in verse 15. and 16.? I beg also the attention of the Editor to Luke II. 46—50. shewing that Jesus was possessed of knowledge of his divine commission even in his early youth and also

to the Editor's own declaration (page 536.) "The spirit of the Lord was to rest upon him as the spirit of wisdom and understanding." Nothing but early prejudice can persuade a man to believe that *one* being at *one time* should be both subject to total ignorance and possessed of omniscience—two diametrically opposite qualities.

Let us now refer to the context of the verse in question. The first verse of the same chapter speaks of the king of Syria and the king of Israel having besieged Jerusalem; verse 3. and 4. of the Lord's having sent Isaiah the prophet to Ahaz the king of Jerusalem to offer him consolation and confidence against the attacks of these two kings; 5. and 6. of the two kings having taken evil counsel against Ahaz and of their determination to set the son of Tabeal on his throne; 8. and 9. foretel the total fall of Ephraim (the ten tribes of Israelites who separated from Judah which comprised the two remaining tribes) and of Samaria within three score and five years; (10. and 11th. mention the Lord's offering to Ahaz a sign which he (12. and 13) declined; 14. 15. and 16. contain the Lord's promise to give spontaneously a sign of the destruction of Ahaz's enemies in the person of the son born by the virgin of Jerusalem;

the delivery of Judah from these two kings before the child should become of age; 17. and following verses foretel what was to happen in Judah bringing the king of Assyria in opposition to the kings of Syria and of Israel, who were then inimical to the house of David. The first four verses of chapter 8th. speak of the birth of a son to Isaiah the prophet and of the depredations by the Assyrians on the land of Damascus the capital of Syria and on the land of Samaria the head of Ephraim, before that son should have knowledge to cry,—"My father and my mother." Hence it is evident that the child mentioned in VII. verse 14. called Immanuel, was much older than the child mentioned VIII. 3; for the attacks upon Syria and Israel by the Assyrians took place only before the former became of age to know right from wrong, but while the latter was still unable to could pronounce a single word. V. 6th. speaks of the army of Rezin and of the son of Remaliah, the kings of Syria and Israel having refused the soft waters of Shiloah*, a river in Judah, figuratively meaning peace; 7. and 8. of the Lord's declaring that he would bring into the land of Immanuel

* Shiloah found in Genesis XLIX. 10. implying a redeemer, differs in signification and also in spelling from the word "Shiloah" herein mentioned as signifying rivers; in Genesis שילה in Isaiah VIII. 6. שלח

upon these invaders the strong waters ofthe river, that is the armies of the king of Assyria; 9th. and 10th. of the combination of the people against the king of Judah which turned to their own destruction for the sake of Immanuel. It is worth noticing that the last word in verse 10. is translated in the English version "God is with us" instead of leaving it as it is in the original Hebrew "Immanuel" though in two other instances ch. VII. verse 14. and ch: VIII. verse 8. the word "Immanuel" is left unchanged as it stands in the original. V. 11. to 17. pronounce the Lord's displeasure at the disobedience of the tribes of Israel; advising them to fear the Lord, and not fear the confederacy of the kings of Syria and Israel. Verse 18. declares the Lord's having given the prophet and the children for signs and for wonders in Israel and the remaining verses of this chapter speak of false prophets of the miserable situation of the Israelites—a fact which is fully related in the book of 2d. Kings; XVI. 5. "Then Rezin king of Syria, and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel, came up to Jerusalem to war; and they besieged Ahaz but could not overcome him. (6.) At that time Rezin king of Syria recovered Elath to Syria, and drove the Jews from Elath and the Syrians came to Elath and dwelt there unto this day.

(7.) So Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglathpileser king of Assyria saying I am thy servant and thy son, come up and save me out of the hand of the king of Syria and out of the hand of the king of Israel, which rise up against me. (8) And Ahaz took the silver and gold that was found in the house of the Lord and in the treasures of the king's house and sent it for a present to the king of Assyria. (9) And the king of Assyria hearkened unto him: for the king of Assyria went up against Damascus and took it, and carried the people of it captive to Kir and slew Rezin."

It is now left to the public to reflect seriously on the above circumstances stated in the context; and to pronounce whether thereby it appears that verse 14th. is originally applied to Hezekiah the son and heir of Ahaz king of Jerusalem, a child born before the defeat of his enemies, the Immanuel whose land was Judah, or to Jesus of Nazareth born at least 500 hundred years afterwards: and also to decide whether or not the land which Ahaz abhorred had been forsaken by the king of Syria and of Israel from the interference of the king of Assyria before Hezekiah came to years of discretion or whether that event took place only after the birth of Jesus.

As to the application of verse the 4th. to Jesus Christ by St. Matthew my language in the Second Appeal was that "the evangelist Matthew referred in his Gospel to ch. VII. 14. of Isaiah merely for the purpose of accommodation; the son of Ahaz and the Saviour resembling each other in each being the means at different periods though in different senses, of establishing the throne of the house of David. In the same manner the apostle referred to Hosea XI. 1. in II. 15 of his Gospel and in many other instances." Nevertheless the Revd. Editor charges me with having blasphemed against the word of God by attempting to persuade him and others in my explanation of the above verse "that the evangelist Matthew ought not to be credited." I indeed never expected such an accusation from the Editor. To acquit me of the charge I entreat my readers to refer to the translation of the four Gospels by Dr. Campbell, a celebrated trinitarian writer, in whose notes page 9. that learned divine says "thus ch. II. 15. a declaration from the prophet Hosea XI. 1. which God made in relation to the people of Israel, whom he had long before called from Egypt, is applied by the historian *allusively* to Jesus Christ, where all that is meant is that with equal truth or rather with much greater energy of significa-

tion God might now say *I have recalled my son out of Egypt.* Indeed the import of the Greek phrase as commonly used by the sacred writers is no more as Le Clerc has justly observed than that such words of any of the prophets may be applied with truth to such an event."

Did these orthodox writers also attempt to persuade people to discredit the evangelical writings by applying Hosea XI. 1. originally to Israel and allusively to Jesus Christ? The Editor will not I presume get the sanction of the public to accuse those learned divines of blasphemy: I did no more than adopt their mode of expression in examining Isaiah VII. 14. Compared with Matthew I. 22 and 23. and Hosia XI. 1. with Matthew II. 15. yet I am charged with blasphemy against the authority of the Gospel of Matthew. I must repeat the very words I used in the Second Appeal in comparing the book of Hosea with the Gospel of Matthew (page 1 9.) that the public may judge whether the language of the Editor as to my attempt to discredit the Gospel is just and liberal. Thus Matthew II. 15. "out of Egypt have I called my son" the evangelist refers to verse 1st. chapter XI. of Hosea: which though really applied to Israel, represented there as the son of God, is used by the apos-

tle in reference to the Saviour, in consideration of a near resemblance between their circumstances in this instance: both Israel and Jesus were carried into Egypt and recalled from thence, and both were denominated in the scriptures the "son of God." The passage of Hosea thus runs from chapter XI. 1—3. "when Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt: As they called them, so they went from them; they sacrificed unto Baalim, and burnt incense to graven images. I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms, but they know not that I heated them": in which Israel, who is represented as a child of God, is declared to have sacrificed to Baalim and to have burnt incense to graven images — circumstaces which can not justly be ascribed to the saviour."

The Revd. Editor likewise in opposition to my explanation applies Isaiah IX. 6. to Jesus "For unto us a child is born; unto us a son is given and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called wonderful, counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting father, and the Prince of Peace": and all that he says (page 534.) in support of his referring this verse to the Deity of Jesus is in these words;—" to secure to Hezekiah that

passage in chapter IX. Our author gives us a translation or rather a paraphrase of it by Jonathan in his Targum to which we shall merely oppose that given by Bishop Louth" Can the interpretation of the old Testament given by Jonathan and other celebrated Jewish writers, some of whom lived prior to the birth of Jesus, be discredited from the authority of one or one thousand Christian Bishops to whom at any rate, Hebrew is a foreign language? Can a Trinitarian in arguing with one not belonging to the orthodox sect and establishment quote with propriety for the refutation of his adversary the authority of a Trinitarian writer? The public may be the best judges of these points. As these Jewish writings are not unprocurable, the public may refer to them for their own satisfaction. Is there any authority of the sacred writers of the new Testament authorizing the Editor to apply Isaiah IX. 6. even in an accommodated sense to Jesus? I believe nothing of the kind—It is mere enthusiasm that has led a great many learned Trinitarians to apply this verse to Jesus: The Editor avoided noticing the context and the historical circumstances which I adduced in my Appeal to prove the application of the verse in

question to Hezekiah. It may be of use however to call his attention again to the subject. I therefore beg of him to observe those facts, and particularly the following instances. Verse 1. ch. IX. promises that Israel shall not suffer so severely from the second as from the former invasion of the king of Assyria, when he invaded Lebanon and Naphtali and Galilee beyond Jordan. So we find it mentioned in 2d. Kings XV. 29. "in the days of Peeka king of Israel, Tiglath-Pileser king of Assyria took Ijon and Abel-Beth-Maachah and Janoah and Kedesh and Hazor and Gilead and Galilee and all the land of Naphtali and carried Israel captive to Assyria"; but in the reign of Hezekiah so far from reducing Israel to captivity, the king of Assyria was compelled to return to his country with great loss, leaving Israel safe in their places: (2d Kings XIX. 35 and 36.) Verses 2. and 3. declare the joy which Israel were to feel at their delivery from the hands of their cruel invaders; and (v. 4.) at throwing off the yoke and rod of the oppressor. We find accordingly in 2d Kings XVIII. 7. that Hezekiah rebelled against the king of Assyria and served him not. Verse 5. foretels the destruction of the army of the invaders. So we find Kings XIX. 34 and 35. that the angel of the Lord slew a great part of the army of the

Assyrian invaders. Verses 6 and 7. speak of the illustrious son who was then to reign with justice, and judgement. So we find in 2d Kings XVIII. 3—7. that Hezekiah during his reign did what was right in the sight of God, so that after or before him there was none like him among the kings of Judah; and that the Lord was with him wheresover he went. Verses 9. and 10. speak of the displeasure of the Lord at the pride and stoutness of heart of Ephraim and the inhabitants of Samaria, the enemies of Hezekiah and his father. So we find in 2d Kings XVIII. 10 and 11. that the people of Samaria were defeated and made prisoners by the Assyrians in the sixth year of Hezekiah. Verse 11, of the Lord's setting up the adversaries of Rezin the king of Syria against him. So we find in Isaiah VII. that Rezin the king of Syria, who with Ephraim besieged Jerusalem at the time the city had borne the child mentioned in chapter VII. 14, was defeated by his adversaries. V. 12 to 20. describe the anger of God as occasioned by the wickedness of Israel. 21. of Ephraim and Manasseh having joined together to invade Judah. Ch. X. verse 1. to 6. denounce punishment to the wicked people of Judah by the hands of the Assyrians. So we find in 2d Kings XVIII. 13. that in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah, the great king of

Assyria came against Judah and took all her fenced cities. Verses 8. to 14. of the boasting of the king of Assyria as to his power and conquests of many kingdoms, and his destruction of the gods of different nations, and of his contempt for the living God of the Jews in Jerusalem. So we find in 2d Kings XVIII. 33—35. and XIX verses 11 to 14. that the king of Assyria boasted of his great power and of having subdued the gods of the nations; and that he despised Jehovah the true living God, even blaspheming him in a message to Hezekiah. Verses 12. to 26. promising to punish the king of Assyria and to bring ruin upon him for his high boastings, and for his contempt against the Lord. So we find in 2d. Kings XIX. 21. to 34. that the Lord encouraged *the* virgin the daughter of Zion and the daughter of Jerusalem to despise the king of Assyria, whom he had determined to punish for his disrespect; and promised safety to the inhabitants of Jerusalem on the prayer offered by Hezekiah. So also we find in 2d Kings XIX. 35. and Chronicles XXXII. 21. that the Lord sent his angel into the camp of the king of Assyria and slew his mighty men, leaders and captains. Verse 27. promises the king of Judah's liberation from the yoke of the king of Assyria. So we find 2d. Kings XVIII. 7. that

Hezekiah rebelled against the king of Assyria and served him not afterwards. It was not Hezekiah alone that in the beginning of his reign acknowledged dependence upon the king of Assyria, but his father Ahaz also confessed the superiority of the king of Assyria, and sued to him for protection against the kings of Syria and of Israel when Hezekiah was only a child: (2 Kings XVI. 7 and 8.)

The public may now judge whether or not the above circumstances and the contents of chapters VII. and VIII. noticed in the preceding paragraphs, determine the application of verses 6. and 7. of ch. XI. of Isaiah to Hezekiah; who "did that which was right in the sight of the Lord,"—"removed high places"—"broke the images and cut down the groves"—"trusted in the Lord God of Israel"—"clave to the Lord and departed not from following him"—"with whom the Lord *was*"—who "prospered whether so ever he went"—and prior and subsequent to whose reign "was none like him among all the kings of Judah." (2d. Kings XVIII. 3—7. And they may also decide whether the delivery of Israel from the attack of the Assyrians and the punishment inflicted upon the king of Assyria in the prescribed manner took place in the reign of Hezekiah or that of Jesus

Christ. If my readers compare minutely ch: 7, 8, 9, 10, and 39, of Isaiah with 2d Kings ch. 15, 16, 18, 19, and 20, they will, I trust, have a still clearer view of the subject.

In common with the son mentioned in Isaiah IX. 6. who was called Hezekiah "*God my strength*," "*Immanuel* "*God with* us" wonderful, counseller, mighty God, the father of the everlasting age, the prince of peace," human beings and even inanimate objects were designated by the same terms or similar epithets as noticed pages 138, 139, 140, 171, and 172, of my Second Appeal without being held up as the most high Jehovah.

Moreover the difference between "to be" "and to be called" is worth observing as I noticed in the note at page 171. of the Second Appeal, to which I beg to refer my readers. As to the phrases "no end" and "for ever" or "everlasting" found in verses 6 and 7. ch. IX. of Isaiah, these when applied to creatures are always to be taken in a limited sense, the former signifying plenteousness, the latter long duration, as I observed in note page 133. of the Second Appeal. Vide Gen. XLIX. 26. Heb. III. 6.

St. Matthew in an accommodated sense applies verses 1st and 2nd of ch. IX. of Isajah

to Jesus whose spiritual reign delivered also the inhabitants of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtalim and Gallilee from the darkness of sin in the same way as in Hezekiah's reign their inhabitants were saved from the darkness of foreign invasion.

As the Editor and many orthodox Christians lay much stress on the application of the term Immanuel to Jesus, I offer the following observations. The sum total of their argument is derived from the following verse Matthew 1. 23 "And they shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." This name is composed of three Hebrew words "Emma" עם with "noo" נו us "el" אל God; that is, with us God; hence the advocates for the trinity conclude that Jesus is here called God, and that he must therefore be God. But let us ascertain whether other beings are not in common with Jesus called by designations compounded with *el* or God in the sacred writings, or whether the term *el* is exclusively applied to Jehovah and Jesus, and then direct our attention to the above stated conclusion: Genesis XXXII 24. "And Jacob was left alone and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day (30.) And he (Jacob) called the

name of the place פניאל Peni*el* for I have seen *God* face to face and my life is preserved" Here the place is called the face of *el* (God) and the angel who wrestled with and blessed Jacob and whom he saw there, is styled *el* (God) (verse 28.) And he (the angel) said thy name shall be called no more Jacob but Israe*l*, for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men and hast *prevailed;*" as Jacob in wrestling with the angel, shewed him his power and prevailed, he was called *Israel* the prince of God, or properly speaking the prince of the angel, for it would be the grossest blasphemy to say that Jacob wrestled with the almighty God and prevailed over him. So we find in Genesis XLVI. 17. "Malchie*l*" that is, my king God." Daniel VIII. 16. "Gabrie*l*" ("mighty God") 1 Chron XV. 18. Jaazie*l* "strong God" 20. Jehie*l* "Living God" I Samuel VIII. 2. The name of his first born was Joel" that is, Jehovah God.

Moreover the very term Immanuel is applied immediately in Isaiah VII. 14. to the deliverer of Judah from the invasion of the king of Syria and that of Israel during the reign of Ahaz; but none esteemed him to be God from the application of this term to him. Besides by referring to Parkhurst's Hebrew Lex-

cion on the explanation of the word *el* (or God) we find " that Christian emherors of the fourth and fifth centuries would suffer themselves to be addressed by the style of "*your divinity*," "*your Godship*." And also by referring to the Old-Testament we find the terms* אל el, אלהים elohim, or God, often applied to superiors: no one therefore can be justified in charging the apostle Matthew with inconsistency on account of his having used even in an accommodated sense the phrase "Immanuel" for Jesus appointed by God as the Lord of the Jews and Gentiles.

The Editor denies the truth of my assertion in the Second Appeal (page 139) that David is also called the holy one of Israel in Psalm LXXXIX. and insists that Jehovah and the future Messiah only are styled the holy one. I therefore beg to refer my readers to the whole context of the Psalm in question, a few passages of which I here subjoin. (Verse 19.) "Then thou spakest in vision to *thy holy one*, and saidst - (verse 20.) I have found *David* my *servant*; with my *holy oil* have I *anointed* him (26) "He shall *cry* unto me, thou art my

* Ezekiel. XXXI. 11. "אל גוים" "The mighty one of the heathen" Exodus XV. 15. "אלי מואב" "The mighty men of Moab." 1 Sam. XXVIII. 13 "אל הים ראיתי" "I saw God" that is Samuel. Exo. XXII. 8. "אל האלהים" "to the Gods" that is the Judges.

father, *MY GOD*, and the rock of *MY SALVATION*." (27.) "Also I *will* make him my first born." (35.) "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto *DAVID*." (38.) "But thou hast cast off and *abhorred*, thou hast been *wroth* with *thine anointed*." (39.) "Thou hast made *void* the covenant of thy servant." (44.) "Thou hast made his glory to cease;" (45.) "Thou hast covered him with shame." The public now may judge whether the above sentences are applicable to king David or to Jesus whose *glory* never *ceased*,—with whom God has never been *wroth*, and who cannot be supposed to have been covered with *shame*. Besides it is evident from this passage that the term "holy one" is applied to one constantly styled a servant.

The Editor inquires (page 570.) what instances I bring that these names peculiar to God, such as wonderful, counseller, the mighty God, the everlasting father, the Prince of peace were applied to certain kings in Israel: I therefore beg to refer him to the passages mentioned in pages 171 and 172. of the Second Appeal in which he will find the same epithets given to human beings and even to inanimate objects.

With a view to deduce the deity of Jesus Christ from the comparison of Isaiah XXVIII. 16. with Isaiah VIII. 13. and with 1 Peter II. 8. the Revd. Editor thus comments (page 570.) " The declaration is that Jehovah of hosts shall be for a stumbling stone and for a rock of offence to the two houses of Israel but after the delivery of this prophecy, was he this to them prior to the coming of Christ? As the house of Israel was carried away captive a few years after the delivery of this prophecy, if not a year or two before, it is doubtful whether they ever saw this prophecy while in their own land, but Christ has been a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to all of every tribe for nearly eighteen centuries while he has been a sanctuary to all who have trusted in him." I need not prolong the discussion by pointing out that Isaiah delivered this prophecy in the reign of Ahaz, that the captivity of one of the houses of Israel took place in the reign of Hezekiah his son, and that of the other house in the reign of Zedekiah the 9th. king of Judah from the time of Ahaz. As the Editor acknowledges the fact of the house of Israel being " carried away captive a few years after the delivery of this prophecy," he will undoubtedly be persuaded to confess also the circumstance of their distress and misery just

before as well as during the time of captivity, by an attentive reference to the sacred histories 2d Kings and 2d Chronicles. The necessary consequence then will be that he will clearly perceive that the above stated prophecy of Isaiah had been duly fulfilled long before Christ's birth, the Lord of hosts having become for a stumbling stone and for a rock of offence to the two houses of Israel soon after the prophet's declaration; and that 1 Peter II. 7. and 8. ("The stone which the builders disallowed the same *is made* the head of the corner. And a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to them who stumble at the word being disobedient") is but a general statement of the ill consequences attached to disobedience, whether on the part of Israel or of the Gentiles, to the *word* delivered to them by Jesus in his divine commission. Jesus is here represented as a stone rejected by men but chosen by God and consequently he must be a stumbling stone to those who reject him, stumbling at his word. Common sense, if not biassed by early prejudice, is sufficient to decide that a stone which is chosen and made the head of the corner by a maker, must not be esteemed as the maker himself.

The Editor comments however on the phrase "made the head of the corner" in verse 7th.

saying "as to his being made the head of the corner by his heavenly father, this can no more affect his unchangeable deity than his being made flesh." This is as much as to say that the circumtance of his being made the head of the corner is as *much* a proof of his changeable nature as the fact of his being made flesh; for were we to admit that the circumstance of an object being made flesh or matter which he was not before, does not evince the changeableness of the nature of that object, we must then be at a loss to discover even a single changeable object in the world. If one's being made flesh and his growth and reduction in the progress of time should not be considered as an evidence of a change in him, every man might claim the honor of an immutable nature and set up as God made flesh.

The Editor says (page 571.) that I "attempted to evade Isaiah XL. 3. ("The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a high way for our God") by coupling it with Malachi III. 1. ("Behold I will send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come into his temple, even the messenger of

the covenant whom ye delight in, behold he shall come saith the Lord of hosts.") and confining his animadversions to the latter." I trust the Editor by referring to Mark 1. 2. and 3. will find that in coupling the above verses I did no more than follow the example of that evangelist who also coupled them in his Gospel. As the explanation adopted by me of the prophecy of Malachi fully explains the passage of Isaiah, I confined my animadversion to the former; for, "we find in the book of that prophet distinct and separate mention of Jehovah and of the Messiah as the messenger of the covenant; John therefore ought to be considered as the forerunner of both *and as the preparer of the way of both;* in the same manner as a commander sent in advance to occupy a strong post in the country of the enemy may be said to be *preparing the way* for the battles of his king or of the general whom the king places at the head of his army." (Second Appeal page 141.) On which explanation the Editor observes that "the fact is that Malachi does not mention two; It is Jehovah who was suddenly to come into his temple; and afterwards Jehovah and the messenger of the covenant are identified by the prophets" adding "he shall come," not "they." But we find in the original Hebrew Malachi III. 1. "*and* the

messenger of the covenant," with the conjunction "and" after the mention of the Lord. It is therefore evident that the messenger of the covenant is *distinctly* and separately mentioned. How the Editor supposes that "Malachi does not mention two," I am unable to guess. We find also immediately after the mention of "the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in," the prophet adds, "Behold he shall come saith the Lord of hosts," as the saying of Jehovah—How can the mention of the messenger of the covenant in the third person by the deity prove the unity of that messenger with the deity? Were we to admit that every being spoken of in the third person by God is identified with God, the number of identified Gods must in that case amount at least to thousands in the sacred writings. It is worth observing that in the original Hebrew "the messenger of the covenant" stands as nominative to the verb בא or "shall come," with the pronoun "he." The verse thus stands in the original. "Behold I will send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before me and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple; *and* the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in behold he shall come, (OR, IS COMING,) saith the Lord of hosts." The Editor adds "that Jesus is Jehovah mentioned in Isaiah

XL. 3. whose way John was sent to prepare, is confirmed by the testimony of Zechariah and John his son." As to the nature of Jesus Zechariah gives us to understand Luke I. 69. that God "hath raised up an *horn* of salvation for us in the house of his servant David." In the evangelical writings of Matthew, Mark, and Luke we find Jesus represented by John as mightier than himself. In John we find still more explicit testimony; I. 29. "Behold the *Lamb* of God who taketh away the sin of the world (30.) This is he of whom I said after me cometh *a man* who is preferred before me." My readers may now judge whether Zechariah and John confirmed the identity of Jesus with Jehovah, or represented him as a creature *raised* and exalted by his and our father, the Most High.

Some orthodox divines having attempted to prove the deity of Jesus by comparing Isaiah XL. 10. ("Behold the Lord God will come with a strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold his reward is with him and his work before him") with Rev. XXII. 12 ("Behold I come quickly and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be") I brought to their notice (in my Second Appeal page 152.) John V. 30.

and 32. " the father judgeth no man; but *hath committed* all judgement *unto the son*"; and Matthew XVI. 27. " For the son of man shall come in the glory of his father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works." To weaken the force of my argument the Editor says (page 573.) " these passages, however, do not in the least affect the question, which is not, by what authority Christ rewards, but whether he be the person described as rewarding; and this, these very passages confirm, particularly Rev. XXII. 12." If in the adminstering of judgement and of reward, as well as in the performance of miracles, the authority by which these things are done should be considered as a matter of no consequence, the almighty power of Jesus and that of several others might be established on an equal footing. Is it not therefore a subject worthy of question whether Joshua ordered the sun and the moon to stop their motions by the authority of God or by his own power? Is it not a question worth determining whether Elijah raised the dead by the authority of the most high or independently of the almighty power? But if we consider it incumbent on us to believe and to know that those prophets performed works peculiarly ascribed to God by the authority of his divine majesty; why

should we not deem it also necessary to ascertain whether the authority to judge men and to reward them accordingly, as well as the power of performing miracles were vested in Jesus by the omnipotent God or exercised by him independently of the father of the universe? In point of fact we find the following positive avowal of Jesus himself—" the father judgeth no man but hath *committed* all judgement unto the son."—" As I hear I judge; and my judgement is just: because I seek not mine own will but the will of the father who hath sent me." Here the Editor offers the following explanation, saying, that "all power as to providence and final judgement is *committed* to him, not merely as the son, but as the son of man, the mediator, because he made himself the son of man." This amounts to the doctrine of the two fold nature of Jesus, the absurdity of which I have often noticed. I may however be permitted to ask the Editor whether there is any authority for the assertion that Jesus as the son of man was dependent on God for the exercise of his power; but as the son of God was quite an independent Deity? So far from meeting with such authority we find that Jesus in every epithet that he was designated by is described to be subject to and dependent on God. Acts XVII. 31.

"Because he hath appointed a day in which HE will judge the world in righteousness *by* that *MAN whom he hath ordained;* whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that HE *hath raised him* from the dead." John VIII. 28. "Then said Jesus unto them when ye have lifted up the SON of MAN then shall ye know that I am he and that *I do nothing of myself;* but as my father hath *taught me* I speak these things" XVII. 1. and 2. "Father, the hour is come: glorify thy son that THY SON also may glorify thee: As *thou hast given HIM* power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as *thou hast given him.*" Hebrews I. 8. and 9. Thy throne O *GOD* is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom: Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity: therefore God even THY GOD hath *annointed thee* with the oil of gladness above *thy fellows.*" The Editor says, "His glory he (the son) may for a season lay aside, but his divine nature he can never change. I wish to be informed what kind of divine nature it was that could be divested of its glory* and power,† even for a season. To my understanding such divinity must be analogous to matter without space or gravity,

* John XVII. 5. and 22. † John XVII. 2. Acts X. 38.

or sunbeam without light, which my limited capacity I must confess, cannot comprehend.

The Editor finally argues that "as the father's committing to the son the entire work and glory of being the final judge of all, judging no man himself does not change his glorious nature, so the son's laying aside his glory and becoming man in no way changes his original nature and godhead." It is true that God's committing to the son the authority of judgement, bestowing on the sun the power of casting light upon the planets round him, and enabling superiors to provide food and protection for their dependents, do not imply any change in his glorious nature; for it is ordained by the laws of nature that nothing can be effected in this visible world without the intervention of some physical means; but that the son's or any other being's *laying aside* his glory and becoming a man must produce at least a temporary change in his nature is a proposition as obvious as any that can be submitted to the understanding.

I have of course omitted to quote John V. 23. during this discussion in my Second Appeal, because it has no relation to the subject

and because I noticed it fully in another part of that publication page 45.

I will also refrain from noticing in this place Hebrews I. 12. alluded to by the Editor as I have already considered that passage as fully as possible in the preceding chapter page 122.

The Editor next comes to Isaiah XLIV. 6. "Thus saith the Lord the king of Israel and his redeemer Jehovah of Hosts, I am the first and I am the last and beside me there is no God" comparing it with Rev. I. 8. and XXII. 13. This argument has been already replied to in my Second Appeal it shall be again adverted to shortly. He then endeavours to prove that Jesus cannot be meant as prohibiting John from worshipping him in verse 9th, saying that " in this book five persons address at different times: two of the elders around the throne, two angels, and he who is the grand speaker throughout the book—whom he after the first chapter often introduces without the least notice, while he previously describes every other speaker, with the utmost care." The Editor however has quoted only instances in which John describes the two elders and the two angels in a distinct manner, but

I cannot find that he adduces even a single instance where the " grand speaker" is "introduced without the least notice." Again he says how could Jesus forbid John to worship him after he received worship by the command of God from all the angels? I may be on the same principle justified in asking the Editor how the angel could forbid John to worship him, while he knew that other angels of God, and even human beings, had received worship from fellow creatures? Joshua V. 14. " And Joshua fell on his face to the earth and did worship and said unto him" (the Captain of the host of the Lord) what saith my Lord unto his servant." Numbers XXII. 31. "And he (Balaam) saw the angel of the Lord standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand, and he bowed down his head and fell flat on his face" Daniel II. 46. "Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face and worshipped Daniel." As the Editor's argument therfore must apply with equal force to angels as to Jesus, it is quite plain that no conclusion can be drawn from it relative to the identity of the being who in Rev. v. 9. of ch. 22. forbids John to worship him. The fact is that the word "worship" in scriptural language is used sometimes as implying an external mark of religious reverence paid to God; and since in this sense worship was offered by John

to the angel or to Jesus, he refused it, as is evident from the last sentence of verse 9th. "worship God;" and sometimes the same word "worship" is used as signifying merely a token of civil respect due to superiors, and accordingly in this latter sense not only Jesus, but angels and prophets, and even temporal princes or masters, used to accept of it, as we find in Matthew XVIII. 26. "the servant therefore fell down and worshipped him"—and so in various other instances. It denotes in this acceptation merely a mark of reverence which neither identifies those to whom it is offered with the deity, nor raises them to a level with their creator, the Most High. My readers will observe that the author of the book of Revelations declares himself in I. 17. to have fallen at the feet of Jesus: and he speaks also in ch. V. 8. of the four beasts and four and twenty elders having fallen down before the lamb, avoiding however in these places as well as throughout the whole book of Revelations the use of the word worship to express the reverence shewn to the lamb; while to the words "fell down" when referring to God he adds invariably "and worshipped him:" vide ch VII. 11. XI. 16. XIX. 4. and V. 14. 3dly. He says "how could Jesus who declares himself to be Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, reject worship

from John?" I do not wonder at the Editor's entirely neglecting to notice my remarks on the terms "Alpha and Omega" or "the beginning and the end" in the Second Appeal page 151. to wit, "Alpha and Omega beginning and end are in a finite sense justly applicable to Jesus," when I find him regardless of the explanation given by John himself respecting these terms and by St Paul one of his fellow labourers. Rev. III. 14 "These things saith the Amen the faithful and true witness, *the beginning of the creation of God:* I know thy works &c." Colossians I. 15. "The first born of every creature." 1 Corinthians XV. 24. "Then cometh the end when he shall have delivered up the kingdom *to God even the father.*" 28. And when *all things* shall be subdued unto him *then* shall the son *also* himself be subject unto him, that God may be all in all."

As to Rev. I. 8th. introduced again by the Editor, the expressions it contains are given as those of God himself and not of Christ, since it describes the speaker to be him "who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty"—an epithet peculiarly applied to God five times in the book of Revelation and very often throughout the rest of the sacred writings, and which is but a repetition of what is found

in the preceding verse 4th. of that chapter. Being equivalent to "Jehovah" it has never been applied to Jesus in any part of the Revelations either separately or joined with the terms "Alpha and Omega." But as I have already fully noticed this verse in page 150. I will not return to the subject here. 4thly. The Editor urges "how could Jesus who searches the heart, reject the acceptance of worship." In answer to which I beg to remind him that the prophets and the apostles also as far as they possessed the gift of prophecy were able to discover what passed in the hearts of other men; or in other words were "searchers of hearts." Thus in the acts of apostles ch. V. 3. and 4. 8. and 9. St. Peter is represented as a searcher of the heart; but he is again stated in ch: X. 25. and 26. to have prohibited Cornelius from offering him worship. And in 2d Kings VI. 32. Elisha is declared to have known what passed in the heart of the king, without our therefore acknowledging him as an object of religious worship.

The Editor lastly lays stress on the phrase found in Rev. VII. 17. "the lamb who is *in the midst* of the throne"—overlooking the application of the same word "midst" to the elders and the four beasts in IV. 6. Besides such a

phrase as "to sit with the father on his throne" implies nothing in the book of Revelation except an acquisition of holy perfection and honor, which Jesus, in common with every righteous Christian, acquired *through his merits* III. 21. "To him that *overcometh* will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also *overcame*, and am set down with my father in his throne."

In answer to his assertion that it is "the lamb whom the blessed constantly adore, crying Holy, holy, holy, Lord God, Almighty" I beg to refer my readers to v. 8th. of ch. IV. which contains this phrase—nay rather to the whole of that chapter, where they will find that no mention of "the lamb" or Jesus is once made.

The Editor observes (page 577.) that "in verses 5, 6, of the XXI. chapter another speaker besides the angel is introduced in an abrupt manner. I therefore repeat verse 11. of ch. XX. and 5. 6. and 7, of ch. XXI. and leave my readers to judge whether or not the speaker here is introduced in the same abrupt*

* In the book of Revelation John introduces, about eighty times, different speakers, but not once without a distinct notice of the speaker in the context: In ch. XVI. 14. and 15. the day of the Lord is me-

manner as he is alleged to be in ch. XXII. 12. according to the interpretation of the Editor; XX. 11. "And I saw a great white throne and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away and there was found no place for them" Ch. XXI. 5. "And *he that* sat upon the throne *said* behold I make all things new. And he said unto me, write, for these words are true and faithful. (6.) And he said unto me it is done, I am Alpha and Omega &c. (7.) He that overcometh shall inherit all things and I will be *his God* and he shall be *my son*."

I really cannot perceive what the Editor could have meant by the following remark "he there (in verse 5.) uses the same language found in ch. XXII 6 Write, for these words are true and faithful!" I hope he could not have intended to identify the speaker in XXII. 6. who represents himself as a fellow servant of John, with the speaker in XXI. 5. who thus, speaking of himself, says (v. 7.) "I will be his God and he shall be my son." Besides the language found in ch. XXI. 5. is not "the very same" used in ch. XXII. 6, since in the former the whole speech stands thus—"*Write, for*

---

taphorically introduced as a speaker. Vide 1 Thess V. 3. and 2 Peter III. 10.

these sayings are true and faithful;" but in the latter we find only "these sayings are faithful and true"; but not the verb "*write*," nor the causal preposition "*for*."

The Editor comes next to what he calls internal evidence, saying "internal evidence however demonstrates that this angel neither said "behold I come quickly" v. 7. nor I am Alpha and Omega v. 13." Let us now examine the context and the style of the writings of the book of Revelations. 1st. There is not a single instance in the whole book of Revelation in which a speech is repeated without the previous introduction of the speaker; and in this instance we find an angel is previously introduced in v. 6. as the speaker of verse 7. The passage in question (6, 7—13.) runs thus "And he said unto me, these sayings are faithful and true: and the Lord God of the holy prophet sent his angel to shew his servant the things which must shortly be done. (7) Behold I come quickly. Blessed is he who keeps the prophecy of this book: (8) I John saw these things and heard them. And when I had heard and seen I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel who shewed me these things. (9) Then saith he unto me, see thou do it not; for I am thy fellow servant and of thy

brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book worship God. (10.) And he saith unto me seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book, for the time is at hand. (11.) He that is unjust let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy let him be filthy still, he that is righteous let him be righteous still: and he that is holy let him be holy still. (12.) And be hold I come quickly: and my reward is with me, to give every, man according as his work shall be (13) I am Alpha and Omega the begining and the end, the first and the last." I am therefore quite at a loss to comprehend how the Editor can justify himself in ascribing verses 6, 8, and 9, to one being, and verse the 7th. to another, in which there is no notice whatsoever of a new speaker. 2ndly. There is only one agent in the whole train of these verses extending as far as verse 20th. and no unbiassed mind can in the face of all the rules of composition reject the relation of a verb to an appropriate nominative standing before it, in order to refer the same to a noun which is not found in any of the immediately preceding sentences. 3rdly. Were we to follow the example of the Editor, and refer verses 6, 8, and 9, to an unknown angel and verse 7. abruptly to Jesus, (which I conceive we cannot do, without defying common sense

and all the acknowledged laws of grammar,) we must be totally at a loss to account for the strange conduct of John towards Jesus, his master, in falling down to worship before the feet of the angel and neglecting Jesus entirely, though he saw and heard them both at one time, or rather his vision of Jesus was subsequent to that of the angel. 4thly. John himself explains whom he meant by the angel mentioned in XXII. 6. identifying this angel with Jesus, expressly named in the first chapter of Revelations. (Ch. XXII. 6.) "And the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel *to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly be done*." (Ch. I. 1.) "God gave unto him (Jesus) *to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass*." As in the English version there is some difference, though of no consequence, in these two phrases, I therefore quote the original containing the precise words in both instances. δειξαι τοις δουλοις αυτου ἁ δει γενεσθαι εν ταχει.

I hope now that the explanation of the author of the book of Revelations, joined with the above stated circumstances will not fail short of producing conviction in the mind of the Editor and my other opponents.

We may easily find out the angel who is described in the latter end of ch. I. verse the

1st. as being sent by Jesus, by reference to ch. XXII. 16. "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things *in the churches.*" We find here two things distinctly: one that Jesus designated as an angel in XXII. 6. *showed*, as directed by God in ch. I. 1., *all things which must shortly come to pass;* and the other that he sent his angel to shew to John and his other servants *these things in the churches* respecting the Christian dispensation, as expressly mentioned in verse 1. of the book of Revelation as well as in XXII. 16. 5thly. I will now have recourse to the rule recommended by the Editor "that when the speaker is not expressly named, his language designates him." As the phrase "I come quickly," found elsewhere in the book of Revelations, is used expressly by Jesus as speaker in five different instances (II. 5. and 16. III. 11. XXII. 12, and 20,) we must naturally ascribe this phrase in verse 7. to Jesus, and must therefore refer the immediately following verses 8th. and 9th. to him in perfect consistency with all other scriptural writings. It is not only in verse 9th. that Jesus calls himself a servant of God, and addresses Christians as brethren, but also in Matthew. XII. 18. he represents himself as a chosen servant of the Most High; and in XXVIII. 10. and John XX. 17. designates the disciples as his brethren.

If the Editor should say, according to the general mode of trinitarian exposition, that the adoption of such designations was in reference to the human capacity of Jesus, he will perhaps give up the present difference from me under the supposition that in this instance also Jesus calls himself a servant of God and his followers brethren, as well as forbids John to worship him, meraly in his human capacity.

I now conclude my reply to this branch of the Editor's argument with a few remarks in allusion to such questions of the Editor as "Is it that the son of God after receiving the worship of the highest archangel at God's express command, forbad John to worship him? &c." I would ask in turn can any man be justified in ascribing deity to one whose language is this,? "As I received of *my father*" (Rev. II. 27.) "I have not found thy works perfect before *God* (III. 2) "I will *confess* his name *before my father* and before his angels" (5.) "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of *my God*" "I will write upon him the name *of my God*, and the name of the city of *my God* which cometh down out of heaven from *my God*" (12.) Is it consistent with the nature of God to acquire exaltation through merit? V. 12 "Saying with

a loud voice, Worthy is the lamb that was slain *to receive* power and riches and wisdom and strength and honor and glory and blessing" III. 21. " To him that *overcometh* will I grant to sit with me in my throne, EVEN AS *I also overcame and am set down with my father in his thone.*" Is it becoming of the nature of God to sing thus, addressing himself to another being,? " Great and marvellous are THY works, Lord God Almighty just and true are THY ways, thou king of saints: who shall not fear THEE O Lord and glorify THY name? for THOU ONLY art holy &c." XV. 3. and 4. Is not the lamb throughout the whole Revelation mentioned separately and distinctly from God? ch. I. 1. " The Revelation *of Jesus Christ* which *God gave* unto him" 2. " who bare record of the word *of God* and of the testimony *of Jesus Christ*" 4. and 5. " And peace *from him* who is and who was and who is to come, *and from* the seven spirits which are before his throne, *and from Jesus Christ* who *is the faithful witness*" 9. " For the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ" V. 9. " Thou wast *slain* and hast redeemed us to *God*" (10.) " and hast made us unto *our God* kings and priests" XI. 15. " The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of *our Lord* and *of* HIS *Christ*" XII. 17. " who keep the

commandments *of God* and have the testimony *of Jesus Christ*" XIV. 12. "that keep the commandments *of God* and the faith *of Jesus*" XXI. 23. "For the glory *of God* did lighten it, and the lamb is the light thereof." John in ascribing to the lamb most honorary epithets, those generally printed in capitals, takes great care in the choice of words. XIX. 16. "He" (the Lamb) "hath on his thigh a name written, king of kings and Lord of Lord's" XVII. 14. "For he (the lamb) is Lord of Lords and king of kings." The apostle never once declares him to be "God of Gods" the peculiar epithet of the Almighty Power. So the most holy saints sing first the song of Moses and then that of the lamb; having perhaps had in view the priority of the former to the latter in point of birth. XV. 3. "And they (the holy saints) sing the song of Moses the servant of God and the song of the lamb"

In answer to one of the many insinuations made by the Editor in the course of his arguments, to wit "If this be Christ, what must become of the precepts of Jesus?" (page 576.) I most reluctantly put the following query in reply. If a slain lamb be God Almighty or his true emblem, what must be his worship and what must become of his worshippers?

On the attempt to prove the deity of Jesus Christ by comparing Isaiah XLV. 23. ("Unto me" i. e. God "every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear") with Rom. XIV. 10—12. ("But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ; for it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me and every tongue shall confess to God: so then every one of us shall give account of himself to God") I observed in my Second Appeal (page 144) that between the prophet and the apostle there is a perfect agreement in substance, since both declare that it is to God that every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess *through him*, before whose judgment-seat we shall all stand: at the same time both Jesus and his apostles inform us that we must stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, because *the father has committed* the office of final judgment to him." To which the answer of the Editor is this, "we here beg leave to ask our author, where the phrase *through him* is to be found? It must be in the author's copy of the prophet and the apostle—it is not in our's." By these words the Editor clearly means to insinuate that the words in question are gratuitously inserted in my explanation and without any au-

thority in the holy scriptures. At least I am otherwise at a loss to understand what he means by saying that the words of my paraphrase are not to be found in his Edition of the Bible, for it would be unworthy to suppose of him that he wished to impress his readers with the idea that I was quoting a particular passage falsely, instead of the fact that I was only giving my idea of its import. That I was fully warranted in my interpretation I hope to convince the Editor himself by referring him to the following passages, in which it is expressly declared that it is *through Jesus* that glory and thanks are to be given to God, and that we have peace with God; and also that it is BY Jesus Christ that God judgeth the world. Romans XVI. 27. "To God only wise be glory through Jesus Christ for ever amen." V. 1. "we have peace with God *through* our Lord Jesus Christ." I. 8. "I thank my God *through* Jesus Christ" II. 16. "In the day when *God* shall *judge* the secrets of men *by Jesus Christ.*" 2 Chr. V. 18. "All things are of God who hath reconciled us to himself *by Jesus Christ.*" John V. 22. "For the father judgeth no man but *hath committed* all judgment unto the son." After considering these texts no one can I think refuse to admit the correctness of my assertion that it is *to God*

every knee shall bow *through Christ* before whose judgment-seat we shall stand "because *the father has committed* the office of final judgment *to him*," as being founded upon the best authority that man can appeal to.

Upon the interpretation of the above mentioned passage of Isaiah, to wit, "it is Jesus that swears here by himself," I observed in my Second Appeal, "how can they escape the context which expressly informs us that Jehovah God and not Jesus sware in this manner." To this the Editor replies that the son was Jehovah before he was Jesus" &c. Is not this merely a begging of the question, inasmuch as one may equally assert that Moses or Joshua was Jehovah before he was Moses or Joshua?

He further says that "Jesus is so preeminently saviour that there is salvation in no other." I agree with the Editor so far as to declare Jesus to be, under God, the only saviour mentioned in the records of the Christian dispensation, but previous to his birth there were many saviours raised by God to save his servants, as noticed already in page 64 and 72.

The Editor adds that in v. 24. righteousness is used in such a sense as is principally appli-

cable to the son. I therefore transcribe the verse that the reader may judge whether or not his position has any foundation. 24. "Surely, shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength, even to him shall men come, and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed."

Respecting the attempt to prove the deity of Jesus from the circumstance of his being figuratively represented as the husband or the supporter of his church, John III. 29. Ephe. V. 23. and also God's being called the husband of his creatures, Isaiah LIV. 5. I requested in my Second Appeal (page 148.) that my readers would be pleased to examine the language employed in these two instances. In the one God is represented as the husband of *all* his creatures, and in the other Christ is declared to be the husband or the head of his *followers;* there is therefore an inequality of authority evidently ascribed to God and to Jesus. Moreover Christ himself shows the relation that existed between him and his church, and himself and God, in John XV. 1. "I am the true vine and my father is the husbandman" 5. "I am the vine, ye are the branches." &c. Would it not be highly unreasonable to set at defiance the distinction drawn by Jesus be-

tween God, himself, and his church? The Editor has not taken the least notice of this last argument; he only glances over the former, saying (page 579.) "had our author examined the context with sufficient care, he would have found that those to whom God declares himself the husband are so far from being all his creatures, that they are only one branch of his church, the Gentiles, the children of the desolate, in opposition to the Jews, the children of the married wife." I wonder how the choice of the designation "thy maker" in Isaiah LIV. 5. in preference to others, and its true force could escape the notice of the Editor; as the phrase "thy maker is thy husband" implies in a general sense that whosoever is the maker is also the preserver, and consequently God is the husband or the preserver of all his creatures, including the Jews more especially as his chosen people. I however wish to know how the Editor justifies himself in concluding real unity between God and Jesus from the application of the term husband to them, while Jesus declares the relation between God, himself, and his church to be such as that existing between the husbandman, the vine, and its branches.

Some orthodox divines having attempted to establish the deity of Jesus by comparing Je-

remiah XXIII. 5. 6. ("I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper—and this is his name whereby he shall be called THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS") with 1st. Cor. I. 30 ("Christ Jesus who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness &c.") I replied in my Second Appeal (page 142) that "I only refer my readers again to the passage in Jeremiah XXXIII. 16. in which Jerusalem also is called "THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS" and to the phrase "IS MADE *unto us of God*" found in the passage in question and expressing the inferiority of Jesus to God; and also to 2 Cor. V. 21. "that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;" where St. Paul says that all Christians may "be made the righteousness of God;" to which the Revd. Editor thus replies—(page 480.) "this does not at all affect the question in hand, which is simply whether this righteous branch of David, this king who shall reign and prosper be Jesus Christ or not; and to prove this we need only call in the testimony of the angel to Mary; Luke I. 32. 33. "the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever." The Editor here overlooks again the force of the phrase "God shall *give* unto him (Jesus) the throne of his

father David," implying that the throne and exaltation which Jesus was possessed of was but the *free gift* of God.

To lessen the force of such phrases as "being *made* of God," "God shall *give* unto him" &c. the Editor adds that "relative to his "being made of God righteousness to us,"—this can of course make no alteration in the son's *eternal* nature." I therefore beg to ask the Editor, if one's being *made* by *another* any thing whatsoever that he was not before does not tend to prove his mutable nature, what nature then can be called mutable in this transitory world? The Editor again advances that Jesus "was Jehovah before he became incarnate &c." This is a bare assertion which I must maintain to be without any ground, unless he means to advance the doctrine that souls are emanations of God and proceed from the deity.

As to Jerusalem being called "Jehovah our righteousness" the Editor says "we may observe that it is the church of Christ, the holy Jerusalem who bears this name to the honor of her gloriously head and husband who is indeed Jehovah her righteousness" (page 581.) Let us reflect on this answer of

the Editor. In the first place the term Jerusalem in Jeremiah XXXIII. 16. from its association with the term "Judah" is understood as signifying the well known holy city in that kingdom, having no reference to the church or followers of Christ. In the second place, if the Editor understands by the term "Jerusalem" here the church of Christ, and admits of Jerusalem being figuratively called "Jehovah our righteousness" on the ground that Christ is its head and that consequently it bears that name "to the *honour* of her glorious *head*" though in reality different from and subordinate to him, how can he reject the figurative application of the phrase "Jehovah our righteousness" to Jesus on the same ground and same principle, which is, that as Jehovah is the head of Christ, consequently Christ bears this name "to the honour of his *head*," though in reality different from and subordinate to God? vide 1 Cor. XI. 3. "But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the HEAD OF CHRIST IS GOD."

The Editor shews an instance in Isaiah in which seven women wish to be called by the name of a husband to have their reproach taken away. He must also know that thousands

of sons and descendants are called by the name of one of their fathers, and servants by the name of their masters, to the honour of the father or the master. Vide Isaiah XLVIII. 1. Genesis XLIII. 6. Hosea XI. 8 snd 9. Exodus XXIII. 21. The Editor then proceeds to divide the honorary names found in scriptures into two kinds; one given by men and the other given by God; but he must know that the names given by prophets or by common men, if used and confirmed by God, or by any of the sacred writers, become as worthy of attention as if they had been bestowed originally by the Deity himself.

The Editor again uses the following words "the incommunicable name Jehovah" the self-existent, from the verb הוה hawah "to be or to exist" which is applied to no one throughout the scripture besides the sacred three" &c. We know very numerous instances in which the name "Jehovah" is applied to the most sacred God, but never met with an instance of applying to two other sacred persons the simple term "Jehovah." I wish the Editor had been good enough to have taken into consideration that this is the very point in dispute, and to have shown instances in which the second and third persons of the deity (according

to the Editor's expression) are addressed by this name. He further observes that "no one supposes that Jehovah Jireh "God will see or provide," given by Abraham to the place where he offered Isaac, was intended to deify that place, but to perpetuate the fact that the Lord did there provide a sacrifice instead of Isaac;—that Jehovah-nissi "God my banner" given by Moses to his altar intended any thing more than that God was his banner against the Amalekites;—that Jehovah-tsidkenu "Jehovah our righteousness" the name men should call Jerusalem, or Christ's church, was intended to deify her, but to demonstrate that her Lord and head who is righteousness, is indeed Jehovah." Here I follow the very same mode of interpretation adopted by the Editor in explaining the same phrase "The Lord our righteousness" found in Jeremiah XXIII. 6. referred to the Messiah, that is, the application of this phrase to the Messiah does not deify him, but demonstrates that his father, his EMPLOYER, his HEAD, the Most High, who is his righteousness, is the Lord Jehovah; so that the consistency can not be overlooked which prevails through all the phrases of a similar nature; for as Christ is represented to be the head of his church, so God is represented to be the head of Christ, as I noticed in the

foregoing page 213. Lastly the Editor says "compound names therefore do not of themselves express deity, but they express facts more strongly than simple assertions or propositions." I am glad to observe that he differs from a great many of his colleagues in their attempt to deify the Messiah from the application of the above phrase to him; but as to the facts demonstrated by this phrase, they may be easily ascertained from comparing the application of it with that of exactly similar phrases to others, as I have just observed.

The Editor now mentions (page 583.) a few more passages which he thinks tend to "illustrate not so much the name as the divine nature of the son. In Jeremiah V. 22. we have this expostulation; 'Fear ye not saith the Lord? Will ye not tremble at my presence who have placed the sand for the bound of the sea by a perpetual decree that it cannot pass it, and though the waves toss themselves, yet can they not prevail.' This however is only a part of that work of creation ascribed to him who, while on earth, exercised absolute dominion over the winds and the waves in no name *beside his own.*" But what this passage of Jeremiah has to do with the divine nature of Jesus I am unable to discover. The Editor might have quoted at

this rate all the passages of the old Testament that ascribe to God the supreme controul over the whole world as evidence in favour of the deity of Jesus as he was sure to find always many persons of the same persuasion to applaud any thing offered in favour of the trinity.

As to his position, that, Jesus "exercised absolute dominion over the winds and the waves in no name beside his own," I beg to quote John X. 25. to shew that whatever power Jesus, in common with other prophets, exercised over wind and water while he was on earth, he did it in the *name of God.* "Jesus answered them I told you and ye believed not; the works that I do *in my father's name* they bear witness of me." "And Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." I say Jesus in common with other prophets, because both Elijah and Elisha the prophets exercised power over wind and water and other things, like Jesus, in the name of the father of the universe. 1st. Kings XVII. 1. ch. XVIII. 44. 45. 2nd. Kings II. 21.; some times without verbally expressing the name of God; ch. V. 8—13 and 27. ch. II. 10.

Upon the assertion in my Second Appeal that the "epithet God is frequently applied in the sa-

cred scriptures to others beside the supreme being" the Editor observes that "this objection Jeremiah cuts up ch. X. 11." "the Gods that have not made the heavens and the earth even they shall perish from the earth and from under these heavens;" which declaration sweeps away not only the Gods of the heathen but all magisterial Gods and even Moses himself as far as he aspired to the godhead: But from this general wreck of our author's Gods, Christ is excepted, he having made these heavens and laid the foundation of the earth." Let us apply this rule adopted by the Editor respecting the prophets, to Jesus Christ. We do not find him once represented in the scriptures as the maker of heavens and earth; this peculiar attribute having been throughout the whole sacred writings ascribed exclusively to God the Most High. As to the instances pointed out by the Editor Hebrews I. 10. and Col. I. 17. I fully explained them in page 117 and 122. as having reference to God the father of the universe. Moreover we observe in the new Testament, even in the same book of Hebrews, that whatever things Jesus made or did, he accomplished as an instrument in the hands of God. Hebrew I. 2. "Whom he hath *appointed* heir of all things *by* whom also he *made* the worlds." Ephesians III. 9. "Who *created* all things *by* Jesus Christ." It would

indeed be very strange to our faculties to acknowledge one as the true God, and yet to maintain the idea that he created things by the directions of another being, and was appointed as heir of all things by that other. Again in pursuance of the same rule of the Editor I find that Jesus like other perishable Gods both died and was buried, though raised afterwards by his father, who had the power of raising Elijah to heaven even without suffering him to die and be buried for a single day. My readers may now judge whether Jesus Christ be not included in common with other perishable Gods in the rule laid down by the Editor.

To deify Jesus Christ the Editor again introduces the circumstance of his being a searcher of hearts to execute judgment: Rev. II. 23. and also quotes Heb: I. 3. Having examined these arguments in page 119 and 200, I will not return to them here.

He adds in this instance "we are hence assured that the father who perfectly knows the son, did not commit to him all judgment so entirely as to judge no man himself without knowing his infinite fitness for the work." It is evident that the father

did not commit to the son all judgment so entirely as to judge no man himself without qualifying him for so doing; that is, without giving him the power of knowing all the events of this world in order to the distribution of rewards and punishments Matthew XXVIII. 18. "*All power* is *given* unto me in heaven and in earth." Notwithstanding this the power of knowing those things that do not respect the execution of judgment by the son is not bestowed upon him; and the son therefore is totally ignorant of them. Mark XIII. 32. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the son*, but the father." No one destitute of the power of omniscience is ever acknowledged as supreme God by any sect that believe in revealed religion.

He quotes Heb, IV. 13. "Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight, but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do," in order to corroborate the idea that Christ knew all the secrets of men. Supposing this passage to be applicable to Jesus Christ, it does not convey any other idea than what is understood by Rev. II. 23. which I have already noticed: But the Editor must know that in the imme-

diately preceding verse the word of God, or Revelation, while figuratively represented as a two-edged sword &c. is in the same allegorical sense declared to be "a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." There is therefore no inconsistency in ascribing the knowledge of the intents of hearts to him through whom that Revelation is communicated, and who is appointed to judge whether the conduct of men is regulated by them in conformity to that Revelation.

The Editor says (page 584) that "in Ezekiel XXVIII. God says respecting a man who arrogated to himself the honors of Godhead, 'son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus, thus saith the Lord God, because thy heart is lifted up, and thou hast said I am a God—behold thou shalt die the death of the uncircumcised &c.' How different the father's language to the son 'thy throne O God is for ever and ever.' Why this different language to the prince of Tyrus and to Jesus?" Had the Editor attentively referred to the scriptures, he would not have taken the trouble of putting this question to me; for he would have easily found the reason for this difference; that is, the king of Tyrus called himself God, as above stated, but Jesus so far from robbing the Deity of his ho-

nor, never ceased to confess that God was both his God and his father. John XX. 17. Also that the prince of Tyrus manifested disobedience to God, but Jesus, even laid down his life in submission to the purposes of God and attributed divine favour towards himself to his entire obedience to the Most High: Rom. V. 19. "for as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the *obedience of one* shall many be made righteous." John X. 17. "*therefore* doth my father love me *because* I lay down my life that I might take it again:" Luke XXII. 42. "father if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless *not my will*, but *thine* be done." As the conduct of the prince and that of Jesus towards God were quite different, they were differently treated by the father of the universe: As to the above verse, ("thy throne O God is for ever and ever,") God does not peculiarly address Jesus with the epithet God, but he also uses for the chiefs of Israel and for Moses the same epithet.

The Editor quotes 1. Cor. IV. 5. "judge nothing before the time until the Lord come; who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart; and then shall every man

have praise of God." The passage simply amounts to this "judge not either me or others before the time until the Lord come, who will bring to light the dark and secret counsels of of men's hearts, in preaching the Gospel; and then shall every one have that praise, that estimate set upon him, by God himself, which he truly deserves" (Locke.)

It is not Jesus alone that was empowered by God to know and to judge all secret events, but on particular occasions others were intrusted with the same power, as has already been noticed in page 200 and will also be found in Daniel II. 23. "I thank thee and praise thee O thou God of my fathers, who hast given me wisdom and might, and hast made known unto me now what we desired of thee; for thou hast now made known unto us the king's matter" and in 2 Sam. XIV. 19 and 20. "And the king (David) said, Is not the hand of Joab with thee in all this? and the woman answered and said,"—My Lord is wise, according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know all things that are in the earth." 1. Cor. VI 2 and 3. "Do you not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest

matters? know ye not that we shall judge angels? &c." Here Christian saints are declared to be judges of the deeds of the whole world, and of course to be possessors of a knowledge of all events both public and private so as to enable them to perform so delicate a judgment. Besides a knowledge of future events is by no means less wonderful than that of past things or present secrets of hearts, yet we find all the prophets of God were endued with the former: 1 Kings XX. 22. "And the prophet came to the king of Israel and said unto him, go strengthen thyself and mark and see what thou dost, for at the return of the year the king of Syria will come up against thee." So we find the same gift of future knowledge granted to righteous men in numerous instances.

He then cites Dan. I. and VII. and founds upon them the following question: "If then by nature he was not God, by nature the creator of heaven and earth, he and his kingdom must perish from under the heavens." To this my reply is, that we find Jesus subjected to the death of the cross while on earth, and after the general resurrection, to him that put all things under him (1 Cor. XV. 28.). The *son* therefore is not by nature God, the creator of

heaven and earth. As to the sophistry that attributes the death and subjugation of Jesus only to his human capacity, it might be applicable to every human individual, alleging that they being the children of Adam, the son of God, (Luke III. 38) are possessed of a divine nature also; and that their death consequently is in their human capacity alone, but that in their divine nature they cannot be subjected to death Vide page 137—143 of this essay.

By applying to Jesus the epithet "most holy" found in Daniel IX· 24. the Editor attempts to prove the eternal deity of the son; forgetting, perhaps, that the same term "most holy" is applied in the scriptures even to inanimate things. Number XVIII. 10. "In the most holy place shall thou eat it." Exodus XXIX. 37. "It shall be an altar most holy."

The Editor in noticing Hosea says that "the Evangelist's quoting this passage (out of Egypt have I called my son") plainly shows that it referred to Christ as well as to Israel; but the difference is manifest: Israel was God's adopted son, constantly rebelling against his father: Jesus was God's proper son of the same nature with his father (as is every proper son) and did always what pleased him." This

assertion of the Editor (that "Israel was God's adopted son") is I think without foundation; for they are declared, like Jesus, to be begotten sons of God; but were not like Christ entirely devoted to the will of the father of the universe. Deu. XXXII. 18. "Of the Rock that *begat* thee thou art unmindful and hast forgotten God that formed thee." Exodus IV. 22. "And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even *my first born.*" He then quotes Hosea III. 5. "afterwards shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God and David their king;" on which he comments that David had then been in his grave—he could be sought only in heaven;—as David in common with other saints, could not search the heart and know the sincerity of prayers, this prophecy must be assigned to the son of David, the Messiah. I really regret to observe that as the Jews endeavour to misinterpret such passages as are most favorable to the idea of Jesus being the expected Messiah, so Christians in general try to refer to Jesus any passages that can possibly be explained as bearing the least allusion to their notion of the Messiah, however distant in fact they may be from such a notion. By so doing they both only weaken their respective opinions. The above citation on which the

Editor now dwells is an instance. Let us refer to the text of Hosea III. 4. "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim; (5) afterwards shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter day." Does not the poetical language of the prophet determine to the satisfaction of every unbiassed man that after long sufferings Israel will repent of their disobedience, and seek the protection of their God and the happiness which their fathers enjoyed during the reign of David; as it is very natural for a nation or tribe when oppressed by foreign conquerors to remember their own ancient kings under whose governments their fathers were prosperous, and to wish a return of their reign if possible. If the Editor insist upon referring this prophecy to Jesus, he must wait its fulfilment; as Israel has not as yet sought Jesus as the son of David the Messiah who was promised to them.

The Editor says (page 586.) that Peter in Acts II. 21. applies to Jesus Joel II. whereby he identifies Jehovah with him; But we find

Peter here quoting only a part of ch. the 2nd. of Joel v. 32. "and it shall come to pass that whosover shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved;" so far from applying this to the son and identifying him with God, the apostle explains in the immediately following verse (22.) his nature and his total subordination to God. "Ye men of Israel, hear these words. Jesus of Nazareth, a *man approved of God* among you, by miracles and wonders and signs which *God did by him* in the midst of you &c." The Editor then adds that Paul also addressed himself "to all who in every place call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." (1 Cor. I. 2.) I therefore quote Locke's paraphrase on this verse, as well as his note on Romans X. 13, with a view to shew the Editor that the phrase "call on the name of Jesus" is not a correct translation in the English version. "To the church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are separated from the rest of the world by faith in Jesus Christ called to be saints, with all that are every where called by the name of Jesus Christ, their Lord and ours," (Locke on 1 Cor. I. 2nd) note on Rom. X. 13. page 384. "Whosover hath, with care, looked into St. Paul's writings, must own him to be a close reasoner, that argues to the point; and therefore, if, in the three pre-

ceding verses, he requires an open profession of the Gospel, I cannot but think that "all that call upon him," verse 12. signifies all that are open, professed Christians, and if this be the meaning "of calling upon him" v. 12, it is plain it must be the meaning of "calling upon his name," verse 13, a phrase not very remote from naming his name," which is used by St. Paul for professing Christianity. 2 Tim. II. 19. If the meaning of the prophet Joel, from whom these words are taken, be urged, I shall only say, that it will be an ill rule for interpreting St. Paul, to tie up his use of any text, he brings out of the old Testament, to that which is taken to be the meaning of it there. We need go no farther for an example than the 6, 7, and 8th verses of this chapter which I desire any one to read as they stand, Deut. XXX. 11—14. and see whether St. Paul uses them here, in the same sense." If the Editor still insists upon the accuracy of the translation of the phrase "call upon the name of Jesus" found in the version, he will I hope refer to Matthew X. 40 41. and 42. "He that receiveth you, receiveth *me* and he that receiveth *me*, receiveth *him that sent me*: He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet, shall receive a prophet's reward; &c. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of

these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward"—when he will perceive that calling on the name of Jesus, as being the Messiah sent by God, is an indirect call on the name of God; in the same manner as one's yielding to a general sent by a king amounts to his submission to the king himself, and secures for him the same favour of the king as if he had yielded directly to the sovereign.

The Editor then quotes Amos IV. 13. perhaps on account of its containing the phrase "declaring unto man what is his thought." As I have noticed this subject already oftener than once page 200 and 227. I will not return to it here.

He again quotes Zechariah III. 2. "and Jehovah said unto Satan, Jehovah rebuke thee, O Satan, even Jehovah that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee! Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire." The Editor then proceeds to say that "this passage with ch. 2. 8. 'thus saith the Lord of hosts, after the glory hath he sent me, and ch. XIII. 7.' Awake O sword against my shepherd, against the man who is my fellow, saith the Lord of

hosts," forms another three-fold testimony of the distinct personality of the son and his equality with the father. I am unable to discover exactly what the Editor intends by his two first quotations. With respect to the former that "Jehovah said unto Satan, Jehovah rebuke thee" &c. the Editor must be well aware that God speaks of himself very frequently throughout the sacred books in the third person instead of the first; Isaiah LI. 1. "Hearken to me ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord &c." 15. "But I am the Lord thy God that divideth the sea, whose waves warred; *The Lord* of hosts is *his* name." Even in this very book of Zechariah we find that the prophet speaks of himself some times in the third person. Zech. I. 7. "In the second year of Darius came the word of Jehovah unto Zechariah" &c. VII. 8. "And the word of the Lord came unto Zechariah saying" &c. Neither God's nor Zechariah's speaking of himself in the third person in poetical language can be construed into a proof of the plurality of either of their persons, or of the equality of either with some other being. The fact is that Zechariah prophesies in the second year of Darius king of Persia of the Lord's will to build the second temple of Jerusalem by Joshua, Zerubbabel and Semuh; and to

rebuke Satan who would discourage Joshua the high priest from that undertaking; as is evident from the following passage. Zechariah I. 1. " In the eighth month, in the second year of Darius, came the word of the Lord to Zechariah " &c. 16." Therefore thus saith the Lord, I am returned to Jerusalem, with mercies my house shall be built in it, saith the Lord of hosts and a line shall be stretched forth upon Jerusalem; " II. 2 " then said I whether goest thou? And he said unto me, to measure Jerusalem " &c. III. 1. and 2. And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him: And the Lord said unto Satan, the Lord rebuke thee, O Satan, even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire." As to Zerubabel, the prophet says, IV. 9. " The hands of Zerubabel have laid the foundation of this house; his *hands* shall also *finish it*" &c. Respecting Semuh, VI. 12. and 13. thus speaketh the Lord of hosts saying; Behold the man whose name is Semuh; and he shall grow up out of his place and *ye* shall build the temple of the Lord: even he shall build the temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne, and he shall be a priest upon his

throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between them both"—that is between Semuh and Joshua mentioned in the immediately preceding verse 11th. In the English version the meaning of the name of Semuh is used, viz. "Branch." instead of Semuh itself both here and in ch. III. 8. and the commentators chuse to apply the name thus translated to Jesus, though no instance can be adduced of Jesus Christ's having been so called, and though the prophet expressly says in ch. VI. 12. "whose name is Semuh." He is speaking of the SECOND building of the temple which began in the reign of Darius king of Persia long before the birth of Christ. Vide the whole book of Zechariah.

The second quotation is "for thus saith the Lord of hosts after the glory hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled you, for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye." II. 8. The prophet here communicates to the people the words of God, that "after he has sent me with his will to the nations who tyrannize over Israel, that* he who touches Israel touches the apple of his own eye." Zechariah very often in his book introduces himself as

* The word כי in the original Hebrew signifies "that" as well as "for." See Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon.

being sent by God; but how the Editor from these circumstances infers the separate personality of the son, or his equality with the father he will I hope explain. If he insists upon the equality of the Most High, with that of him who says in the verse in question "after the glory hath he sent me." (upon some ground that we know nothing of,) he would be sorry to find at last that he equalizes Zechariah instead of Jesus with God. I will according to the plan already adopted notice the third quotation "Awake O sword" (XIII. 7.) in a subsequent chapter among the other passages alluded to in the second chapter of this work.

CHAPTER IV.

On the Editor's replies to the arguments contained in chapter 2nd. of the Second Appeal.

To my inquiry in the Second Appeal "have we not his (Christ's) own express and often repeated avowal that all the powers he manifested were committed to him as the son by the father of the universe" the Editor thus replies in the negative (page 588.) "No-That he was appointed by the father to act as mediator between him and sinners, we have already seen; for without this he could have been no mediator between his father and his offending creatures." Every unbiassed man may easily pronounce whether it is consistent with any rational idea of the nature of the Deity that God should be appointed by God to "act the part of a mediator," by "laying *aside* his *glory* and taking on himself the form *of a servant*;" and may discern whether it is not most foreign to the notion of the immutable God, that circumstances could produce such a change in the condition of the Deity as that

he should have been not only divested of his glory for more than thirty years but even subjected to servitude? Are not the ideas of supreme dominion and that of subjection just as remote as the east from the west? Yet the Editor says that while he was stripping himself of his glory and taking upon himself the form a servant he was just as much Jehovah as before.

The Editor in common with other trinitarians conceives that God the son equally with God the father (according to their mode of expression) is possessed of the attributes of perfection, such as mercy, justice, righteousness, truth &c., yet he represents them so differently as to ascribe to the father strict justice or rather vengeance, and to the son unlimited mercy and forgiveness, that is, the father, the first person of the Godhead, having been in wrath at the sinful conduct of his offending creatures, found his mercy so resisted by justice that he could not forgive them at all, through mercy, unless he satisfied his justice by inflicting punishment upon these guilty men; but the son, the second person of the Godhead, though displeased at the sins of *his offending creatures*, suffered his mercy to overcome justice, and by offering his own blood as an atonement for their sins, he has

obtained for them pardon without punishment; and by means of vicarious sacrifice, reconciled them to the father and satisfied his justice and vengeance. If the justice of the father did not permit his pardoning sinful creatures and reconciling them to himself in compliance with his mercy, unless a vicarious sacrifice was made to him for their sins; how was the justice of the son prevailed upon by his mercy to admit their pardon, and their reconcilation to himself, without any sacrifice, offered to him as an atonement for their sins? It is then evident that according to the system of trinitarians the son had a greater portion of mercy than the father to oppose to his justice, in having his sinful creatures pardoned, without suffering them to experience individual punishment. Are these the doctrines, on which geniune Christianity is founded? God forbid!

If the first person be acknowledged to be possessed of mercy equally with the second, and that he, through his infinite mercy towards his creatures, sent the second to offer his blood as an atonement for their sins, we must then confess that the mode of the operation and manifestation of mercy by the first is strange and directly opposite to that adopted by the second, who manifested his mercy even by the

sacrifice of life, while the first person displayed his mercy only at the death of the second, without subjecting himself to any humiliation or pain.

In answer to the Editor's position that Jesus even as a mediator was possessed of every power and perfection that was inherent in his divine nature, I only beg to remind him of a few sacred passages among many of a similar nature: John III. 35. "the father loveth the son and hath GIVEN all things into his hand;" XVII. 22. "and the glory which thou GAVEST me I have given them;" &c. V. 26. "for as the father hath life in himself so hath he GIVEN to the son to have life in himself;" Luke I 32. "and the Lord God shall GIVE UNTO him the throne of his father David." Matthew IX. 8. "But when the multitude saw it they marvelled, and glorified God who *had given such* power to MEN;" XXVIII. 18. Jesus came and spake unto them saying, *all power* is GIVEN unto *me* in heaven and in earth." On these texts I trust no commentary is necessary to enable any one to determine whether all the power and glory that Jesus enjoyed were given him by God or were inherent in his own nature.

The Editor again denies Christ's having "possessed a single power, perfection, or attribute which was not eternally inherent in his divine nature;" and defies me "to point out one attribute or perfection in the father, which from scripture testimony, the son has not been already shown to possess." I therefore take upon myself to point out a few instances which, I hope, will convince the Editor that the peculiar attributes of God were never ascribed to Jesus, nor to any other human being who may have been like Jesus, figuratively called Gods in scriptural language. In the first place the attribute of being the "Most High" or עליון by which the supreme Deity is distinguished above all Gods, is not found once ascribed to Jesus, though invariably applied to the father throughout the scriptural writings. 2ndly. Jesus was never called almighty or שדי a term peculiarly used for the deity; nay moreover he expressly denies being possessed of almighty power: Matthew XX. 23. "But to sit on my right hand and on my left IS NOT MINE TO GIVE but to them for whom it is PREPARED of MY FATHER;" XXVI. 53. "thinkest thou that I cannot now pray TO MY FATHER and *he* shall presently GIVE ME more than twelve legions of angels;" John XI. 41. "then they took away the stone from the place where

the dead was laid; and Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, father I *thank thee* that *thou hast heard me.*" He also denies his omniscience Mark XIII. 32. "but of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, *neither* the *son* but the father." Any being if not supreme, almighty, and omniscient and more especially one subjected to the transitions of birth and death, must, however highly exalted, even by the title of a God, and though for ages endowed with all power in heaven and in earth, be considered a created being; and like all creatures, be in the end, as the apostle declares, subject to the creator of all things. Besides in the creed which the generality of trinitarians profess, God is described as self-existent having proceeded from none; but the son, on the contrary, is represented as proceeding from the father. Here even the orthodox amongst Christians ascribe the attribute of self-existence to the father of the universe alone.

In my Second Appeal I observed that "the sun, although he is the most powerful and most splendid of all known created beings, has yet no claim to be considered identical in nature with God, who has given to the sun all the heat &c." to which the Editor replies

"what is the sun to his maker?" I wish he had also added "but that which a son and creature is to his father and creator? When he again inquires saying "if the sun has no claim to Godhead has it's maker none"? (alluding to Christ) he might have recollected that neither the sun nor Jesus has ever arrogated to himself Godhead, but that it is their worshippers that have advanced doctrines ascribing Godhead and infinite perfection to these finite objects. Notwithstanding that we daily witness the power of the glorious sun in bringing into life and preserving to maturity an infinite variety of vegetable and animal objects, yet our gratitude and admiration recognise in him only a being instrumental in the hands of God, and we offer worship and duty to him alone who has given to the sun all the light and animating warmth, which he sheds on our globe. On the same ground whether we understand from scriptural authority that the supreme Deity made through Jesus Christ all the things belonging to the Christian dispensation, or every thing relating to this visible world, (as interpreted by the *worshippers* of Jesus,) we must not, in either case, esteem him as the supreme deity, in whose hand he is represented by the same scriptures but as an instrument.

The Editor says that though the power of effecting a material change without the aid of physical means be peculiar to God, "yet this power Christ not only possessed but bestowed on his apostles." Supposing Jesus alone had the power of effecting material changes without the aid of physical means and of bestowing on others the same gift it could have proved only his being singular in the enjoyment of this peculiar blessing of God, and not his being identical or equal with him who conferred such a power on him; but it is notorious that Jesus was not at all peculiar in this point. Were not the miracles performed by Joshua and Elijah as wonderful as those done by Jesus? Did not Elijah bestow on his servant Elisha the power of effecting changes without physical means by putting his own spirit on him? Is Elijah from the possession of this power to be considered an incarnation of the supreme deity? 2 Kings II. 9. "And it came to pass when they (Elijah and Elisha) were gone over that Elijah said unto Elisha, *ask* what I *shall do* for thee before I be taken away from thee. And Elisha said, I pray thee let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me: (10) "And he said thou hast asked a hard thing, nevertheless if thou see when I am taken from thee, *it shall be so unto thee*, but,

if not, it shall not be so." (11) "And Elijah was taken up by a whirlwind into heaven." (12) "And Elisha saw it and he cried, my father, my father, &c. 14. "And when he had smitten the waters they parted hither and thither, and Elisha went over." (15) When the sons of the prophets saw him, they said, the spirit of Elijah doth rest on Elisha. And they came to meet him and bowed themselves to the ground before him." Besides we find in the evangelical writings that notwithstanding the power of performing miracles given by Jesus to his apostles, they could not avail themselves of such a gift, until their faith in God was become firm and complete: It is thence evident that God is the only source of the power and influence that one creature has over another. Matthew X. 1. "And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease." Ch. XVII. 16. "And I brought him (the lunatic child) to thy disciples and they could not cure him." (19) "Then came the disciples to Jesus apart and said why could not we cast him out? (20) "And Jesus said unto them because of your unbelief; for verily I say unto you, if you have faith as a grain of

mustard seed, you shall say unto this mountain, remove hence to another place and it shall remove, and nothing shall be impossible unto you." (21.) "How be it this kind goeth not out but by *prayer* and fasting." Mark XI. 22. "And Jesus answering saith unto them (his disciples) *have faith* in God (23.) for verily I say unto you that whosever shall say unto this mountain be thou removed" &c.

In my Second Appeal I mentioned that it is evident from the first ch. of Genesis that "in the beginning of the creation God bestowed on man his likeness and sovereignty over all living creatures. Was not his own likeness and that dominion peculiar to God, before mankind were made partakers of them? Did God then deify man by such a mark of distinction"? on which the Editor thus remarks; "it is in reality asking did God make him cease to be a creature by thus creating him? we presume he expects no answer." If the Editor acknowledges that God by bestowing on man his peculiar likeness and dominion did not make him cease to be a creature, is he not according to the same principle obliged to admit the opinion that altho' God raised Jesus above all, and bestowed on him a portion of his peculiar power and influence, yet he did not make him cease to be a creature.

In my Second Appeal (page 14. and 15.) I selected nineteen passages out of many in which Jesus distinctly disavows the divine nature and manifests his subordination to God; to which the Editor replies, "they can prove nothing to his purpose, till they shew that his thus becoming incarnate, changed that divine nature which he possessed from eternity &c." I therefore take upon myself to ask the Rev. Editor, whether the following passages found among those already quoted do not prove the entire humanity of the son, or (in the words of the Editor,) a complete change in his divine nature, if he was ever possessed of it? "as the father *gave me commandment even so, I do.*" "I CAN OF MINE OWNSELF DO NOTHING:" "all that the father *giveth me* shall *come* to *me*" "as my father hath *taught me* I *speak* these things" "*To my father* and your father and *to my God* and your God." "Behold *my servant* whom I have chosen." If these declarations do fall short of shewing the human nature of the person who affirms them, I as well as the Editor, would be at a loss to point out any saying of any of the preceding prophets that might tend to substantiate their humanity. The Editor may perhaps say, after the examole of his orthodox friends, that these as well as other sayings to the same effect proceeded

from Jesus in his human capacity, I shall then entreat the Editor to shew me any authority in the scriptures, distinguishing one class of the sayings of Jesus Christ as man from another set of the same author as God. Supposing Jesus was of a two-fold nature divine and human, as the Editor believes him to be; his divine nature in this case, before his appearance in this world, must be acknowledged perfectly pure and unadulterated by humanity: But after he had become incarnate, according to the Editor, was he not made of a mixed nature of God and man, possessing at one time both opposite sorts of consciousness and capacity? Was there not a CHANGE of a pure nature into a mixed one? I will not, however, pursue the subject further now as I have already fully noticed it in another place. (page 137 and 140.) The Editor adverts here to Heb. I. 10. 1 Cor. XV. 24 and 25. but as I have examined the former in page 122 and the latter in page 126. I will not revert to the consideration of them in this place.

At page 589. the Editor thus censures me "to say that in the mouth of the father "for ever and ever" means only a limited period, is to destroy the eternity of God himself," and he quotes "Jehovah shall reign

for ever and ever." I have shown by numerous instances both in my Second and in the present Appeal, that the terms "for ever" "everlasting," when applied *to any one except God*, signify long duration I therefore presume to think that the Editor might have spared this censure as being altogether undeserved. I will here however point out one or two more passages in the mouth of the father, which contain the term "for ever" and in which it can imply only long duration; Gen. XVII. 8. "And I will give unto thee and unto thy seed after thee—all the land of Canaan for an *everlasting* possession" Jeremiah VII. 7. "then will I cause you to dwell in this place in the land that I gave to your fathers *for ever and ever*" Daniel VII. 18. "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom forever even for ever and ever." Is the land of Canaan now in possession of Israel; and will it remain in their possession after all rule, authority, and power have been put down, and after the son has delivered up his kingdom to God the father of the universe? 1 Cor. XV. 24 and 28.

The Editor in the course of this discussion notices Philippians II. 6, whence he concludes that Jesus was in the form of God and thought it not robbery to be equal with God,

yet took upon himself the form of a servant and became obedient to death: I will therefore first give the verse as it stands in the English version and for the purpose of shewing the gradual progress of truth, I will add some subsequent translation of the same verse by eminently learned trinitarian authors, and finally transcribe it as found in the original Greek with a verbal translation.

English version: Philippians II. 6. "who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

Secondly in a new translation from the original Greek by James Macknight D. D. verse the 6. thus stands "who being in the form of God did not think it robbery to be like God". So John Parkhurst M. A. the author of a Greek and English Lexicon to the new Testament, who was also an orthodox writer, thus translates conformably to the opinion of Drs. Doddrige and Whitby, two other celebrated orthodox writers. page 322. "Phil. II. 6. το ειναι ισα θεῳ to be as God. So ισα θεῳ is most exactly rendered agreable to the force of ισα in many places in the LXX. which Whitby has collected in his note on this place. The proper Greek phrase for equal to God is ισον τῳ θεῳ, which is

used John V. 18." "therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath but said also that God was his father, making himself equal with God." (This is not the only instance that the Jews misunderstood Jesus, for in many other instances they misconceived his meaning. John II. 19. 21. ch. VI. 41. and 42. 52. 60)

The term "to be like God" as it is used by several orthodox writers, neither amounts to an identity of one with the other, nor does it prove an equality of the former with the latter. Genesis I. 26. "God said let us make man in our image and after our *likeness*." 1. Chronicle XII. 22. "at that time day by day there came to David to help him, until it was a great host *like* the host of God." XXVII. 23. "The Lord said that he would increase Israel *like* to the stars of heaven." Zechariah XII. 8. "In that day shall the Lord defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and he that is feeble among them at that day shall be *as* David: and the house of David shall be *as* God, *as* the angel of the Lord before them." 1 John III. 2. "But we know, that when he shall appear, we shall be *like him* &c."

Another trinitarian author Schleusner, in his Lexicon to the new Testament renders the

passage "non habuit prædæ loco similitudinem cum Deo." "He did not esteem likeness to God in the place of a prey." The substance of this translation is adopted in the improved version of the new Testament.

1 2
3dly. The original Greek runs thus ὡς εν
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
μορφῃ θεου ὑπαρχων ουχ ἁρπαγμον ἡγησατο το ειναι ισα θεῳ
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Who in form of God being, not robbery
8 9 10 11 12
thought the being like God. Which words arranged according to the English idiom, will run thus; "who being in the form of God did not think of* the robbery the being like God." This interpretation is most decisively confirmed by the context of the verse in question; verse 2nd. of the same chapter. "Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory, but *in lowness of mind*: let each esteem others *better* than themselves (3.) and look not every man on his own things but every man also on the things of others (4.) *Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus* (5.) who being in the form

* We find the verb ἡγεομαι implying to esteem as well as to think with a simple accusative, Peter III. 9. ὡς τινες βραδυτητα ἡγονται "as some men count slackness." (properly speaking, "think of slackness.")

of God did not think of the robbery of being like God (6.) but made himself of no reputation and took upon himself the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men." Where the sense of a passage is complete without introducing an additional word more than is expressed, no one, unless devoted to the support of some particular doctrine, would think of violating fidelity to the original text by interpolation in the translation. Here the apostle requires of us to esteem others better than ourselves, according to the example of humility displayed by Jesus who, notwithstanding his Godly appearance, never thought of those perfections by which he approached man's ideas of God, but even made himself of no reputation. It would be absurd to point out one's own opinion of his equality with God as an instance of humility. How can we be following the example of Christ, in thinking others better than ourselves, if he, as the orthodox say, did not think even his father higher than himself. We however must not suffer ourselves as to be misled by any such orthodox interpretation; to entertain so erroneous an idea of Christ's opinion of himself bearing in mind that Jesus himself proclaims "my father is greater than I" John XIV. 28.

No one can be at a loss to understand the difference of essence between Christ and his creator God implied in the phrase.—" Being in the form of God;" as the distinction between "being God" and "being in the form of God" is too obvious to need illustration. Even Parkhurst one of the most zealous advocates for the trinity thought it absurd to lay stress on the term "being in the form of God" in support of the deity of Jesus Christ (see page 443.) "μορφη perhaps from the Hebrew מראה appearance and מה aspect. Outward appearance, form, which last word is from the Latin *forma* and this, by transposition, from the Doric μορφα for μορφη· see Mark XVI. 12. (comp: Luke XXIV. 13.) Philippians II. 6. 7. where the 6. verse refers not, I apprehend, to Christ's being real and essential God or Jehovah (though that he is so is the foundation of Christianity), but to his glorious appearance, as God before and under the Mosaic dispensation."

Should any one in defiance of the common acceptation of the word "form" and of every authority insist upon its implying real essence in the phrase, "Being in the form of God;" he must receive it in the same sense in the following verse, "took upon himself the form of a servant:" and he must then admit and be-

lieve that Christ was possessed of the real essence of God and the real essence of a servant. How can we reconcile real Godhead with real servitude, even for a moment?

Nor can the phrase "was made in the likeness of man" in verse 7th. be admitted to identify him with Jehovah. any more than we can allow that Samson is so identified by the use of the parallel expression in Judges XVI 7. and 17. "I shall be weak and be as a man" "and be like any man." In the English version, the word *other* is found; that is, "be like *another* man;" which is not warranted by the original Hebrew, as Mr. Brown, an orthodox commentator, justly remarks in the margin.

The Editor says (page 590.) "relative to Christ's being the first-born of every creature, we reply with Dr. Owen, whose work on Socinianism has never been answered:—It is not said Christ is πρωτοκτισος, first created; but πρωτοτοκος, "the first born" and Christ is so the first born, as to be the only begotten son of God, is so the first of every creature that is, he is before them all, above them all, heir to them all, and so no one of them." Altho, both "first-created" and "first-born" from the

common acceptation of these words, equally imply a created nature, yet the reason for St. Paul's choice of the word "first born" is obvious; for when used in reference to a creation not produced in the natural course, first-born signifies superiority to other creatures of the same class, and not "an only begotten son," as Dr. Owen and the Editor seem to suppose. I will here point out the sense in which the word "first-born" is used in the scriptures, when obviously not relating to natural birth Exodus IV. 22. We find in the mouth of Jehovah himself Israel designated by the terms "my son, even my *first born*." Again Jeremiah XXXI. 9. "I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is *my first born*." Psalm LXXXIX. 27. "I will make him (David) my *first born* higher than the kings of *the earth*." And now I will take upon myself to ask the Editor whether Israel, as well as David, was so "first born" as "to be the only begotten son of God" and was also "before all the creatures, above them all, heir to them all, and so no one of them;" or whether that designation was not rather applied both to the nation and to the individual because they were principal pe sons and to shew that they were respectively chosen of God above the rest of his creation. Romans VIII. 29. "For whom

God did fore-know he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his son, that he might be the FIRST-BORN among many BRETHREN." St John defines what would be understood by the term "to be *born of God*." Vide 1 John IV. 7. "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God and *every one that loveth is born of God* and knoweth God." Hence Jesus is considered and declared to be the head of the children of God. So the term "only begotten son" signifies most beloved among children whether natural or spiritual, and not an only son of a father; as we find in Heb. XI. 17. this very term applied to Isaac though Abraham had another son by Hagar.

As to his assertion "Christ is no one of them" (that is of creatures) I only quote a few passages, in which Jesus himself and his apostles enumerated him as "one of them." Matthew XXV. 40. "verily I say unto you, in as much as ye have done it unto one of the least of these *my brethren*, ye have done it unto me." Here it is the king and Lord sitting upon the throne of his glory at the last day, who is represented as styling the poor and helpless his brethren. XXVIII. 10. Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go and tell *my* brethren that they go into Galilee; and there shall they

see me" John XX. 17. "But go to my brethren; and say unto them I ascend to my father and your father and to my God and your God" 1 Cor. IX. 5. "As the *brethren* of the Lord and Cephas. Heb. II. 11. "For he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are *all of one* (father) for which cause he is not ashamed to call them *brethren*." (12) "Saying I will declare thy name unto *my brethren*. In the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.

As to the Editor's reliance on the subsequent verses to shew that the creation of all things was effected by Christ, I refer my readers to page 110 of this essay where I observe that the apostle Paul means in these passages only the creation of all the things in the Christian dispensation as is explained in Ephesians I. 21. and 22, which represent Jesus as all things belonging to the church. I need not renew the subject of revelations repeated by the Editor as I have already examined it in page 200 and 223.

I have shewn in pages 193 and 194 that whatever power Jesus possessed either as man, son of man, God, or son of God, he received the same from the father of the universe; there-

fore the assertion of the Editor that ("certain powers were conferred on Jesus, not as a man —but as the Messiah, Christ, the anointed son of God") is I presume one of the mysteries of the doctrine of trinity. How can the Editor reconcile the passages quoted in my Second Appeal to this assertion? Let him answer what is there advanced in the course of the discussion of this very subject, of a few points of which I beg to remind him.

1st. "In John XVII. 5. 'and now O father glorify me with thine ownself with the glory which I had with thee before the world was' with the same breath with which he prays for glory, he identifies the *nature*, in which he does so, with that under which he lived with God before the creation of the world." Is not this petition to God for glory by the same person who says he was with God before the foundation of the world? Was he before the foundation of the world a man or of a two-fold nature human and divine? If he was God almighty before the foundation of the world, how could that God implore another being for the restoration of the glory, which he at one time had but lost subsequently?

2ndly. In John VIII. 42. Jesus declares that he came not of himself, but that God sent

him. Does not he avow here that his coming to this world was not owing to his own will, but to the will of another being? Was he not entirely at the disposal of God the Most High, even before his coming into this world? In Heb. X. 5. 6. and 7. the apostle declares that Jesus, at the time of his coming to the world, saith, that God had prepared him a body, and that he comes to the world to do the *will of God.* Had he been God before he had come to this world, how could he, in common with all other creatures, attribute his own actions to the will of the supreme disposer of all the events of the universe?

The Editor next quotes a part of Heb. I. 12. thou art the same. This I have fully noticed in page.

The Editor disapproves highly of my assertion in the Second Appeal "Christ was vested with glory from the beginning of the world." I therefore beg to quote one or two scriptural passages, which I hope will justify that assertion. 1 John II. 13. "I write unto you fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning Rev. III. 14. these things saith the beginning of the creation of God."

The Editor insinuates that I have contradicted myself by "ridiculing the idea of

Christ's having two natures" after I had declared that Christ "lived with God before the creation of the world" and that "it would have been idle to have informed them (the Jews) that in his mere corporeal nature Jesus was inferior to his maker, and it must therefore have been his spiritual nature, of which he here avowed his inferiority to God." I can not perceive what contradiction there is in the assertion that Christ lived in the divine purpose and decree* before the world was, and that he not merely as a man, before the assuming of the office of the Messiah, was inferior to his creator, but that he was so even after he had been endowed with the holy spirit in the river of Jordan, and with the power of performing miracles, which is said to be a spiritual gift.—Supposing he like Adam lived with God before his coming into this world, (according to the doctrines maintained

* On John XVII. 5. He had it (the same glory) with the father before the world was, that is, in the father's purpose and decree: In the language of scripture, what God determines to bring to pass is represented, as actually accomplished, thus, the dead are represented as living, Luke XX. 36—38. Believers are spoken of as already glorified, Rom. VIII 29. 30. Things that are not, are called as though they were, Rom. IV. 17. And in verse 12. of this chapter, Judas is said to be destroyed, though he was then living and actually bargaining with the priests and rulers to betray his master see also verse 10. Ept. I. 4, 2Tim. I. 9; Rev. XIII. 8; Heb. X. 34. (Improved version.)

by some Christians) and afterwards was sent to the world in the body of Jesus for effecting human salvation, as John the Baptist was esteemed to be Elijah, even this doctrine does not preclude us from rejecting the idea of a two-fold nature of God and man.

The Editor says that when "he (Jesus) emptied himself of his glory, did he lay aside his divine nature of which his glory was merely a shadow."? and then he recommends me to reflect for a moment on what the term glory implies: "understood either of praise or grandeur, it is merely the reflection or indication of a glorious nature:" I have reflected for some years past and do now seriously reflect on the divine nature but I find it inconsistent with any idea I can admit of the eternal and unchangeable almighty that he should empty himself of his glory, (call it praise or grandeur which you like) though for a season, and should afterwards offer supplications for the same glory to himself, as if another being, addressing that otherself as his own father, since God is often declared to have hardened the heart of men so to disqualify them from perceiving his glory, instead of having degraded himself by setting aside his own title to praise or the grandeur which is inherent in his nature.

The Editor adds "if it was *deserved* glory it was that of which his nature was worthy, and the father's giving it to him, when no being existed beside *the sacred three*, was the father's attestation to the son's eternal Godhead." If the father's giving to Jesus deserved glory should be acknowledged as amounting "to his attestation to the son's Godhead," we must be under the necessity of admitting the attestation of Jesus to the eternal deity of his apostles from the circumstance of his having given them the *same deserved glory*—John XVII. 22. "and the glory which thou hast *given me* I have given them" &c.

The Editor twice says that "Micah informs us that the son is from everlasting." I wish he had mentioned the chapter and verse to which he alludes, that I might have examined the passage.

He perhaps alludes to the phrase "everlasting" found in the English version in Micah V. 2. "out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." I will therefore quote Parkhurst's explanation of the original Hebrew word עולם which is translated in the English

version "everlasting;" and then notice the translation of this very Hebrew word in many other instances by the authors of the English version; and lastly I will repeat the context, that my readers may be able to judge whether any stress can be laid on the phrase alluded to by the Editor.—First from Parkhurst's Hebrew and English lexicon "עלם or עולם is used both as nouns and participles, for time hidden and concealed from man, as well indefinite, Gen. XVII. 8. 1 Sam. XIII. 13. 2 Sam. XII. 10, and eternal, Gen. III. 22. Ps. IX. 8. as finite, Exod. XIX. 9. XXI. 6, 1 Sam. I. 22, comp. ver. 28. 1 Sam. XXVII. 12. Isa. XXXII, 14; as well past, Gen. VI. 4. Deut. XXXII. 7. Josh. XXIV. 2. Psal. XLI. 14. CXIII. 3. Prov. VIII. 23. as future. It seems to be *much more frequently* used for an *indefinite*, than for *infinite*, time. Sometimes it appears particularly to denote the continuance of the Jewish dispensation or age, Gen. XVII. 13. Exod. XII. 14, 24. XXVII. 21, and al, freq, and sometimes the period of time to the Jubilee, which was an eminent type of the completion of the Jewish and typical dispensation by the coming and death of Christ." 2ndly the author of this lexicon (though devoted to the cause of the trinity) gives the translation of the term עולם found in Micah V. 2. in the

course of explaining the force of the word מיי. Says he "Mic. V. 1, or 2. ומוצאתיו and his (the Messiah's) goings forth have been from of old, מימיעולם from the days of antiquity." 3dly from the English version Isaiah LXIII. then he remembered the "days of old" or ימיעולם, exactly as is found Micah V. 2. 1 Samuel XXVII. 8. "those nations were of old" for the same Hebrew term עולם. Deut. XXXII. 7. "remember the *days of old*" for the same Hebrew word. Genesis VI. 4. "which were of old men of renown" for the same term עולם Psalm LXXVII. 5. "I have considered the days of old and the years of ancient times;" here the term קדם which is rendered in Micah V. 2. "*of old*" and the term עולם translated in the same verse "*everlasting*" are both mentioned. 4thly The context is verse 2. 3. and 4. "whose goings forth have been from old, from everlasting; therefore will he give them up, until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth; the remnant of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel: and he shall stand and feed in the strength *of the Lord* in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God &c." Can the phrases "*his God*" "*in the strength of the Lord*," and "*his brethren*" be consistently used for one who is the everlasting God? If so, how can

we reconcile to our understanding the idea of the everlasting God's reigning in the strength of another, having the Jews as his brethren and looking up to another superior who is designated by "his God"? If a body of men distinguished for their talents, learning, and situation in life, from time to time, be determined to support their long established inventions in defiance of scripture, reason, and common sense; how can truth make it's appearance, when so violently resisted? In fact verse the 2d. of Micah thus correctly stands. "Out of thee" (Bethlehem) shall he (the last expected Messiah) come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel whose sources* of springing forth have been from of ancient, from the days of old."

The Editor advances that "even son" implies an eqality of nature with the father certainly it does so, when referred to one carnally begotten, but otherwise it signifies a distin-

* These are the seed of Abraham and that of David through which God declares by the mouths of the ancient prophets that he will raise the Messiah to save the World—vide Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon "3. the place whence any thing comes Job. XXVIII. 1. Isaiah LVIII. 11. Psalm LXV 9. LXXV. 7 in which last passage מוצא is used for that part of the heavens whence the solar light יצא cometh forth i. e. the east. Comp Ps. XIX. 6. 7." Parkhurst also rejects the popular meaning saying, "not his (Messiah's) eternal generation from the father, as this word has been tortured to signify."

guished creature. 1 Chro. XXVIII. 6. "And he said unto me, Solomon thy son, he shall build my house and my courts for I have chosen him to be *my son* and I will be his father." Job. I. 6. "When the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord" &c. Is Solomon because he is called a son of God to be considered a partaker of the divine nature? Are the angels designated "the sons of God" considered to be of the same nature with the Deity? The Editor however adds (page 594.) "our author hints that in the sacred writings others have been termed the sons of God, this however only proves that Christ is by nature the son of God, while all others are the sons of God by adoption or metaphorically." To establish Christ's being the only son of God he quotes Rom. VIII. 32. in which Christ is termed God's own son, and John I. 16 where he says that "the holy spirit also terms him not merely the only son but the only begotten son of the father" I therefore quote here verse the 32nd. in question, with the preceding verse of the same chapter of Romans. "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own son but delivered him up for us all, how shall not he with him also freely give us all things?" Here St. Paul proves beyond doubt the unli-

mited mercy of God towards men, as manifested by his appointment of his own son to save mankind from death at the risk of the life of that son, without limiting the honour of a spiritual birth to Jesus and denying to others the same distinction. who, in common with Jesus, enjoy it according to unquestionable sacred authorities. Deut. XXXII. 18. "of the rock that *begat* thee thou art unmindful." Exodus IV. 22. *Israel is my even my first born.* 2 Samuel VII. 14. "I will be his (Solomon's) father and he shall be *my son*, if he commit *iniquity* I will *chasten him* with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men." Did St. Paul mean to destroy the validity of these as well as of many other texts to a similar effect, by representing Christ as the *only* being distinguished by the title of son of God and excluding angels, Adam, Israel, Solomon, and David from this spiritual dignity ? I firmly believe he did not.

If a king, who had several children, sent one of them to fight battles against those who committed depredations on his subjects, and his son so sent, gained a complete victory in that war but with the loss of his own life, and if with a view to exalt or magnify the attachment of this sovereign to his poeple, one

of his subjects declares that his sovereign was so deeply interested in the protection of his people as to send his own son, even the most be loved, to repel the enemies at the hazard of his life, and that he had not spared his own son in securing the lives of his people: Does he confine the royal birth to that son or does he degrade other sons of the king from that dignity? I beg my readers will read Romans VIII. 31. and 32. and reflect upon their purport—Besides we find in the original Hebrew Gen. I. 27. "God created man in *his image*" and in the English version "*in his own image.*"

Did the original writer of Genesis mean that God created man in some fictitious or adopted image resembling that of God? Did the authors of the English version violate the original construction by adding the word "*own*" to the phrase "in his image?" Or did they add it only for the energy of expression? Psalm LXVII. 6. "God even our *own* God shall bless us"—does the writer here exclude God from being the God of the world, by the use of the word *own* in the verse, against the declaration of Paul: Rom. III. 29. Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? yes of the Gentiles also."

Or does he use this word to shew the Israelites' especial attachment to God? In 1 Tim. I. 2. Paul uses the expression "Timothy my *own son* in the faith" Did he thereby exclude his thousands of spiritual disciples from being his sons in the faith?

In reply to his allusion to John I. 16 in which Jesus is said to be "the only begotten son of the father." I beg to refer the Editor to Hebrews XI. 17. "By faith Abraham when he was tried, offered up Isaac and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son." Whence he may perceive that the phrase "only begotten" implies only most beloved among the children, as Abraham had at that time another son beside Isaac namely Ishmael by Hagar given to him as his wife Gen. XVI. 3. and 15. Were we to take the word of John "only begotten" in it's literal sense in defiance of Hebrew XI. 17, we must discredit the express word of God, declaring Israel his begotten and first born son, and describing David to be his begotten son.

It is worth noticing that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews applies the last phrase "begotten son" in an accommodated sense to Jesus Heb. I. 5. I say in an accommodated

sense, since in Psalm II. 7. it is David that declares, during the prosperous time of his reign, "The Lord hath said unto me, thou art *my son, this day* have I begotten thee." Besides how can the orthodox Christians, who consider Jesus as the begotten son of God from eternity, with consistency maintain the opinion that God had begotten him at a particular day during the reign of David? They may perhaps apply some of their mysterious interpretations to this passage of the Psalms; but they will of course, in that case, pardon my inability to comprehend them. I will not return to the subject of Rev. I. 8. and Hebrew I. 10., though the Editor recurs to them in this place.

As to his frequent repetition of such phrases as "Jesus is Jehovah God"—"a tremendous being in his wrath" &c., I only say they are best calculated to work upon the minds of those that are brought up in the notion of the trinity, but do not carry any weight with them, in an argument subject to the decision of an enlightened public.

I asserted in my Second Appeal that Jesus removed the doubt that arose with regard to the sense in which the unity should be

taken in John X. 30. ("I and my father are one,") by representing the unity so expressed to be such as he prayed might exist amongst his apostles, which was of course the unity of will and design and not identity of being, as is evident from John XVII. 11. "that they be *one* as *we are*" and verse 22. "that they may *be one* even as *we are one*," on which the Editor makes the following remarks.

"The declaration John XVII. 22. 'that they be one even as we are one' was made at a time and to persons totally different from that in John X. 30. 'I and my father are one' the latter was made to the gainsaying Jews, and the former in prayer to his heavenly father; nor is there the least hint given that any doubt had arisen among the disciples respecting the expression 'I and my father are one.' It astonishes me very much to meet with a new rule laid down by the Editor that no commentary upon, or explanation of a passage or phrase by the author of it can have any weight, if it is made or given at a subsequent period in the course of a solemn prayer to God, or before a body of new hearers, without an express declaration of their doubts as to the meaning of it. If this rule stand good, many commentaries and notes by au-

thors, on their respective works, must cease to be of use, and the universally adopted rule, that passages of scriptures should be explained by their reference to one another, must be annulled. In ch. X. 30. "I and my father are one." Jesus declares unity to subsist between himself and God; and in ch. XVII. 11. and 22. by praying that "they (his disciples) may be one as he and the father are one" he explains that the unity between him and the father was of the same kind as that which he prayed to be granted to his disciples; hence by the unity so prayed for cannot be meant any thing else than unity of will and design. Altho' that unity may not be of the same degree that subsisted between him and the father, yet the force of the preposition "AS" shews that it is of the same kind.

Jesus could not mean in praying for his apostles verse 11. an unity in nature among them, whence we might have inferred unity in nature between him and his God; since they were long before this prayer created in the one human nature: nor could he pray for a renewed spiritual nature to be given to them, (as the Editor thinks to be the case) because they were already endued with that spiritual union, as is evident from the passage

of the very chapter XVII. "they have kept thy word,"—"and have known surely that I came out from thee and they have believed that thou didst *send me*,"—"they *are not of the world even as I am not of the world*,"—"the glory which thou gavest me *I have given them*." Besides unity in spiritual nature is not the same kind of unity which subsists between the individuals of one nature.

Supposing unity of nature existed between God and Jesus Christ (as the Editor believes) in the same manner as it is found in one begotten by a man or animal and his parents, and that Jesus actually meant by the words "my father" in verse 30. to affirm God to be his real father, would it not be quite idle in Jesus to have declared that he as a son was of the same nature with his father, instead of saying that he was a son entertaining the same will and design with his father, since the former circumstance is natural and obvious, but the latter is not always found to exist, as we daily find among the children of men. Were the circumstance of one's calling God his father received as a proof of his being actually the son of God, and, of course, of his unity in nature with the Deity, we must consider David as a real son of God

and of the same nature, (Psalm LXXXIX. 26. "he shall cry unto me, Thou art MY FATHER, my God and the rock of my *salvation*") and we also must esteem Israel one in nature with God; (Jeremiah III. 4. "Wilt thou not from this time cry unto me, MY FATHER thou art the guide of my youth)." We must even admit all Christians to be one in nature with the father of the universe, for we are taught to pray to OUR FATHER in heaven Matthew VI. 9. See also verses 1, 4, 6, 8, 14, 15, 18 and 32 of the same chapter: John XX. 17. "My father and your father" &c. 2 Cor. I 3. "the father of our Lord Jesus Christ and the father of mercies &c." To enable my readers to take a clear view of this passage, I here quote the context, as well as the note found in the Improved Version upon it; verses 29 and 30. "My father, who gave them me, is greater than all: and none is able to pluck them out of my father's hand." "I and my father are one" that is "To snatch my true desciples out of my hand would be to snatch them out of my almighty father's hand; because 'I and my father are one;' one in design, action, agreement, affection. See ch. XVII. 11. 21. 22. 1 Cor. III. 8. "Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one." (Improved version) Both in the scriptures and in ordinary com-

position, unity, when referred to two substances, implies invariably perfect concord of will or some other qualities and by no means oneness of nature; a fact which my readers will perceive by a slight attention to the common usage of language and also to the following verses—Gen. II. 24. "and he (the husband) shall cleave unto his wife and they two shall be *one flesh*" Ezekiel XXXVII. 19. "I will take the stick of Joseph and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah and make them ONE stick and they shall be *one* in mine hand" 1 Cor. X. 17. "For we being many, are *one* bread and *one* body; for we are all partakers of that *one* bread."

I never amused myself with the thought that Christ did "pray that his disciples might be one with him and his heavenly father, nor did I ever rejoice at the idea that Jesus "a man approved of God" was one in nature with the invisible Most High; I only observed in my Second Appeal, that if trinitarian authors succeeded in their attempt to prove the Deity of Jesus Christ from a perverted interpretation of such phrases as "the father in me and I in him,"—"he dwelleth in God and God in him," they would unavoidably increase the number of the persons of the Godhead much

beyond three, since similar expressions are frequently found applied to the disciples of Jesus—John XIV. 20. "At that day ye shall know (addressing himself to his disciples) I am in my father and ye *in me* and I *in you* XVII. 21. "thou father art in me and I in thee that they may be also *one in us*" John VI. 56. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him." 1 John IV. 15. "whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the son of God—*God dwelleth in him and he in God.*" 2 Peter I. 4. "that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature."

The Editor seems displeased at my having declined to submit indiscriminately to my countrymen the whole doctrine of the new Testament, because certain passages therein having undergone human distortions, occasion much dispute. I therefore beg to refer him to page 14 of this Essay as well as to all church history, which shew that my plan was conformable to the example laid down by the apostles and primitive Christians, who used to accomodate their instructions to the gradual progress of their followers.

In answer to his question "how was it that I did not feel struck with the absurdity

of a creature's creating all things" &c. I beg only to reply by another question viz. how does the Revd. Editor justify the idea that one, who was in the human shape possessed of human feelings and subject to the calls of nature, was the very God whom he defines as existing for ever, immaterial, invisible, and above all mortal causes or effects?

The Revd. Editor says that "nothing can be more incorrect than my assertion page 26. that Jesus in John X. disavowed the charge of making himself God:—after having borne the fullest testimony to his equality with God in ch. V. and VIII., at length prevaricates and retracts for fear of death." I therefore refer to ch. V. and VIII. and now ask the Editor whether he calls the following sayings of Jesus found in chapter V. and VIII. the fullest testimonies to his equality with God? "The son can do nothing of himself,"—"for the father loveth the son and *sheweth him* all things that himself doth,"—"so the son quickeneth whom he will; for the father judgeth no man but hath *committed* all judgement unto the son,"—"he that heareth my word and believeth on him that *sent me* hath everlasting life,"—"so hath he *given to the son* to have life in himself and hath given him authority" &c. "I

can of my *mine* ownself do nothing,"—I seek not *mine own will*, but the will of the father who hath *sent me*,"—"for the works which the father hath *given me* to finish &c.—"I am come in *my father's name*"—Ch. VIII. "but he that sent me *is true*,"—"I do *nothing of myself* but as my father hath taught me I speak these things."—"But now ye seek to kill me *a man* that hath told you the truth which I have *heard* of *God*,"—"neither came I myself but *he sent me*,"—"I seek not mine own glory,"—"I know him (God) and keep *his saying*"* Do these testimonies amount to the equality of Jesus with his God and father? If so, the Editor must have in view a definition of the term "equality" quite different from that maintained by the world. I at the same time entreat the Editor to point out a single verse in either of these two chapters containing a proof of the equality of Jesus Christ with God, setting in defiance all the phrases, I have now quoted from these very chapters. After reflecting upon the above cited phrases the Editor will, I hope, spare the charge that Jesus "at length prevaricates and retracts for fear of death;" for, his disavowal of deity in ch. X. 36. was quite consistent with all the doctrines and precepts that he taught in the evan-

* As to John V. 23. I beg to refer my readers to the subsequent chapter of this Essay where I will examine the same verse fully.

gilical writings. (Vide the whole of the four Gospels.)

The Editor then adds that "the confession (in X. 34. 35. and 36.) which our author terms a disavowal of deity, was the very confession for which they sought again to take him, because they still thought he made himself God." I am therefore under the necessity of quoting the context to shew that the Jews seemed appeased at the explanation given by Jesus himself as to their misunderstanding of him, and that they sought again to take him, on account of another subsequent assertion of his; The context is (32.) "many good works have I shewed you from my father, for which of those works do ye stone me?" (33) The Jews answered him saying, for a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God: (34.) Jesus answered them, is it not written in your law; I said, ye are Gods? (35) If he called them Gods unto whom the word of God came, (and the scripture cannot be broken) 36. Say ye of him whom the father hath sanctified and sent into the world, thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the son of God? (37.) If I do not the works of my father, believe me not: (38.) but if I do, though ye believe me not, believe the

works: that ye may know and believe that the father is in me* and I in him: (39) *therefore* they sought again to take him: but he escaped out of their hand." Does not Jesus here appeal to scripture, on the ground that if the sacred writings, every assertion of which is but true, are justified in calling magistrates and prophets Gods, and that the Jews in reading the scriptures styled those superiors by the epithet Gods in conformity to their scriptures, they could not in justice accuse him, the sanctified Messiah of God, of blasphemy for his having called himself only the son of God. Does not Jesus here justify the use of the phrase "son of God" for himself, in the same metaphorical sense that the term "Gods" was used for the magistrates and prophets among Israel? If so, he of course relinquishes his claim to the use of the phrase "God" and "son of God" in its real sense. If a commoner, who holds a high situation under Government, suffers himself to be called "honourable" and consequently be accused of presumption in permitting himself to be designated by that title, on the ground that he was not actually the son of a nobleman, would he not justify

* I have already in a preceding page (278) stated that such a phrase as "one is in another and the other is in him" implies in scriptural language only unity in design and will, as it is frequently applied to the apostles in reference to God and to their Lord and master Jesus Christ.

himself against this charge, by saying "You call all the judges Lords in their judicial capacity, though they are not noblemen by birth yet you charge me (who hold a more dignified situation than the judges) with arrogance, because I suffer myself to be addressed as "honourable" a title which the children of noblemen enjoy." In following the example of Jesus, I now appeal to scripture and also to common sense, that my readers may judge thereby whether verses 34. 35. and 36. contain a confession of Godhead or a disavowal of deity made by Jesus himself.

It is not only a single instance, in which Jesus omitted to correct the Jews in their misconceiving the phrase "the father is in me and I in him" (verse 38.) but in many other instances, he left them in ignorance. John II. 19. and 21. When Jesus told the Jews to destroy the temple, that he might raise it again in three days, they misunderstood him and supposed that he intended to raise the temple of Jerusalem and found fault with him from this misconceived notion before the high priest: John II. 21. "but he spoke of the temple of his body." As well as John VII. 34—36. VIII. 21. and 22. as I noticed

before in page 101, 253. The Editor, lastly, says that "Jesus at last chose to die under this very charge rather than clear up the mistake, if it was such. This was their last and grand charge 'we have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the son of God,' which they esteemed blasphemy worthy of death." The Editor must be well aware that the Jews had such an inveterate enmity against Jesus that they not only charged him with what they found in him contrary to their law, but even with wilful exaggerations: John V. 15. "The man departed and told the Jews, that it was Jesus who had made him whole: 16. And therefore did the Jews persecute him (Jesus) and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day;" (to perform a cure on the sabbath day is supposed by the Jews to be a breach of the traditions of the elders and not a crime worthy of death, yet they sought to kill Jesus under that pretence) 17. "but Jesus answered them, my father worketh hitherto and I work: therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath but said also that God was his father, making himself equal with God." Altho' the Jews, in their own defence, called God their father, without subjecting themsel-

ves to the charge of blasphemy, (John VIII. 41. "*we have one father* even *God*") yet they sought to kill Jesus on the false ground, that he equalized himself with God by calling God his father—It is worth observing that lest the Jews should infer his independence in doing miracles and wrest his words from the purpose, ("my father worketh hitherto and I work") Jesus firmly avows his entire dependence on God in whatever he had performed, in verse 19. ("verily I say unto you the son CAN do *nothing* himself &c.") and also in the following verses; in so much that the Jews being unable to find any plea for his destruction, remained quiet and left Jesus in peace. Vide the whole of chapter 5th. In Luke XXIII. 2. the Jews charged him with having perverted the nation by representing himself as their king and having forbidden to give tribute to Cæsar; a charge which was full of misrepresentation.

Let us return now to the text quoted by the Revd. Editor "we have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the *son of God*." Whence it is evident that notwithstanding the great hatred which the Jews entertained towards our saviour, and the misrepresentation they were a guilty of in their accusation against him, the severest charge

which they preferred under the pretence of religion was that " he made himself the son of God" and they would have of course accused him of having made himself God, to Pilate whom they found inclined to release Jesus and in presence of the multitude, this being better calculated to excite the wrath of the latter and horor of the former, had the Jews ever heard him declare himself God or say any thing that amounted to his claim to the Godhead. The high priest and other chief accusers knew very well that their people were taught to consider God as their father and to call themselves the children of the Most High (correctly speaking the *sons* of the Most High, Psalm LXXXII. 6.) and this idea was so familiar among them, that Jesus also admitted them to be the particular children of the Deity; Mark VII. 27. " But Jesus said unto her let the children first be filled &c."

The Editor says (page 597.) that " our author queries on what principle any stress can be laid on the prophetic expression quoted in Heb I from the Psalms 'thy throne O God is for ever and ever,' we reply merely on this principle, that it is spoken by God who cannot lie." Are not these words also " ye are Gods"

spoken by him who cannot lie? Is not the very verse of Hebrews "thy throne O God is for ever and ever" applied originally to Solomon by him who cannot lie, and in an accomodated sense to Jesus by the apostle? I will not introduce the subject again, it having been noticed in page 120. The Editor expresses his astonishment at what I say in the Second Appeal, that the phrase "for ever" must mean a limited time when referred to an earthly king or a creature; and therefore it carrys no weight in the proof of the deity of Jesus, when applied to him. The reason which he assigns for his surprize is, How could I take this phrase in a finite sense when applied to Jesus the eternal Jehovah? Did not the Editor feel astonished at the idea that he employs the application of the phrase "for ever" in his attempt to prove the deity of Jesus and then employs the circumstance of the eternal deity of Jesus, for the purpose of proving that infinite duration is understood by the phrase "for ever" when referred to Jesus.

As he admits that "for ever" when referred to a creature, implies a limited time only, he therefore must spare this phrase and try to quote some other term peculiar to God, in his endeavour to establish the deity of Jesus.

The Editor says that the expression of Jesus to Mary John XX. 17. "Go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my father and your father and to my God and your God" was merely in his human nature—I wish the Editor had furnished us with a list, enumerating those expressions that Jesus Christ made in his human capacity, and another shewing such declarations as he made in his divine nature, with authorities for the distinction. I might have in that case attentively examined them as well as their authorities. From his general mode of reasoning I am induced to think, that he will sometimes be obliged, in explaining a single sentence in the scriptures, to ascribe a part of it to Jesus as a man and another part to him in his divine nature. As for example John V. 22. and 23. "For the father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgement unto the son; that all men should honor the son, even as they honor the father, he that honoreth not the son, honoreth not the father who sent me." The first part of this sentence "hath committed all judgement unto the son" must have been (according to the Editor) spoken in the human nature of Jesus Christ, since the almighty in exercising his power does not stand in need of another's vesting him with that power. The second

part of the same sentence "all men should *honor* the son as they *honor* the father" must be ascribed by the Editor to Jesus as God, he having been worthy to be honoured as the father is—and the last part "who hath sent me" relates again to Christ's human capacity, since it implies his subjection to the disposal of another. Is this the internal evidence of Christianity on which the orthodox divines lay stress? Surely not.

As to the exclamation of Thomas John XX. 28. "My Lord and my God" it is neither a confession of the supreme deity of Jesus by him, nor is it a vain exclamation, since it is evident from verse the 25th, that Thomas doubted Christ's resurrection without any reference to his deity, and that when he saw Jesus and the print of the nails, he believed it, and being struck with such a circumstance, made the exclamation "my Lord and my God" according to the invariable habits of the Jews, Arabs, and almost all other Asiatic nations, who, when struck with wonder, often make exclamations in the name of the deity; and that Jesus from these apparent circumstances and having perceived his heart, says "because thou hast seen me thou hast believed:" (29.) by which Jesus acknowledges the belief of

Thomas in the fact which he doubted in verse 25; that is, his resurrection, for the subject in question as it stands in the context has no allusion to the deity of Jesus and the form in which a confession is made is totally different from that of exclamation, both in the scriptures and in ordinary language. How can Thomas be supposed to have meant to confess the deity of Jesus in a mere exclamation "my Lord and my God" without adding some phrase conveying confession such as "thou art" my Lord and my God and "I believe you to be" my Lord and my God? I beg that my readers will attentively refer to the context and to the common habits of Asiatics on occasions similar to this, and form their opinion respecting this subject. The Editor quotes Matthew V. 37. which with its context forbid all sorts of swearing; but what relation this has to the exclamation of Thomas in John XX. 28. I am unable to discover.

The Editor quotes six passages from the Gospel and the Book of the Revelations, four of which I have already examined and I notice now the remaining two verses. First John I. 1. "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God." By the first sentence ("in the beginning

was the word") the Editor attempts to prove the eternity of the son ; by the second (" the word was with God") his distinct personality; and by the third (" the word was God") his deity.

Let us first take this verse in it's literal sense and ascertain whether or not it is, in that case, intelligible. " In the beginning" i. e. in the first time ; " was the word" i. e. existed such a sound as was capable of conveying a meaning: " the word was with God" i. e. this sound existed in the Deity, since no sound can exist of itself. " The word was God" i. e. the word was the deity, or a deity, or being like other attributes of the deity, it was divine.—The whole verse thus stands " from the beginning the word of God, or Revelation manifesting his will and commandments, existed with him as God himself;" and by the same word God made or established all things; as the Jewish and Mohummudan, as well as Hindoo theologians believe, on the authority of the works respectively acknowledged by them, that God made and established all things by his word only. Vide Gen. I. 3. et seq. And he communicated that Revelation to the world through Jesus Christ, (as testified before hand by John the Baptist)

for the purpose of effecting the salvation of those that received and believed the authority of that Revelation. This is detailed throughout verses 2—12.* In verse 13 and 14 John expressly personifies "the word" in Jesus as the bearer and deliverer of that Revelation "the word was made flesh (or the word was flesh) and dwelt among us" &c. To explain fully this metaphorical representation, John designates Jesus by this name with the additional words "of life" once in his epistle 1 John I. 1. "The word of life" and with the additional words "of God" once in Rev. XIX. 13. "His name is called the word of God" whereby he manifests that Jesus, as the deliverer of the word of God, is called by that name, and not actually identified with the word, as otherwise might have been supposed from his Gospel I. 1. John I. 1. is not the only instance in which an attribute of the deity is thus represented as one with God; for the very same writer identifies love with the deity in John IV. 8 and 16 on the ground that love is of God and is manifested in the world by him. 1 John IV. 7.

---

* The reason for the use of the masculine gender in these verses both in the original Gospel and in the English version is obvious as the original word λογος signifying the "word" is masculine.

Secondly, I have to notice the orthodox exposition of the verse in question; they interpret the word "beginning" as signifying all eternity, and by the term "word" they understand Jesus the son of God; that is, from all eternity the son of God existed with God distinct in person, and he was also God. The interpretation is, I presume, equally unscriptural as it is revolting to the understanding, and for several reasons: First. As long as a passage can be consistently taken and understood in it's literal sense, there can be no apology for taking it in a figurative one. Here we find no authority for identifying Jesus with the "word" or designating him by that term in any of the preceding Gospels; he is only figuratively so called in Rev. by the name of "the word of God." Under these circumstances, to understand Jesus literally and so abruptly by the term "word" in John I. 1., (against the established doctrine of the Jews and the rest of the oriental nations) and to assume this word as existent in the beginning and as instrumental in the hands of God in moral and physical creations, is entirely inadmissable. 2ndly. The Evangelist John in his Gospel uses the word "beginning" in a finite sense and generally implying the beginning of the Christian dispensation, John XVI. 4. XV. 27. VIII. 25. 44. VI.

64. II. 11. and not once for "all eternity." Hence to understand the word "beginning" in an infinite sense is opposed to the sense adopted throughout the whole of his Gospel. 3rdly. In the first verse of Genesis "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," we find in a similar connection the same phrase "in the beginning." Were we to follow the orthodox interpretation and take it in an infinite sense, (i. e. from eternity God created the earth and heavens) we should be compelled to profess the eternity of the world and become materialists. 4thly. To acknowledge the son to be the true God and to have lived with the true God from eternity destroys at once the idea of the unity of God and proves, beyond every question, the plurality of the Deity. For, if we see one real man living with another real man, though both of them are one in nature and design, are we not compelled by the ordinary course of nature to apprehend the duality of man, and to say that, there are two men? Can orthodox ingenuity prove that there are not two but one man, or prevent the comprehention of the duality of man? If not, I wish to know whether after admitting that the real God, the son, exists with the real God, the father, from eternity, the Editor can consistently deny the ex-

istence of two real Gods? 5thly. The exposition of the Editor must render John I. 1. directly contradictory of Deut. XXXII. 39. "I am he and there is *no God with me*." Here Jehovah himself expressly denies having another real God with him in the universe, for he is often said to have had fictitious Gods with him, and therefore Jehovah's denial in this verse must be referred and confined to real Gods: Psalm LXXXII. 1. "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, he judgeth among the Gods." He then addressed himself to those nominal Gods of Israel, among whom he stood "I said *ye are Gods*." (in verse 6) But we firmly believe that John, an inspired writer, could not utter any thing that might contradict the express declaration of Jehovah, though the Editor and others, from a mistaken notion ascribe this contradiction to the Evangelist. 6thly. They thus render the last sentence of the verse "the word was God" without the indefinite article "a" before "God," while they translate Exodus VII. 1. "I have made thee (Moses) a God to Pharoah," though in the original Hebrew there stands only the word אלהים or "God" without the indefinite article "a" before it. If regard for the divine unity induced them to add the article "a" in the verse of Exodus "*a* God to Pharoah," why

did not the same regard, as well as a desire of consistency, suggest to them to add the article "a" in John I. 1. "the word was *a* God?" We may however easily account for this inconsistency. The term "God" in Exodus is applied to Moses, the notion of whose deity they abhor, but as they meant to refer the same term in John I. 1. to Jesus (whose deity they are induced by their education to support) they leave the word "God" here without the article "a" and carefully write it with a capital G. Lastly, if eternity be understood by the phrase "In the beginning" in John I. 1. and Jesus Christ be literally understood by the "WORD" then we shall not only he compelled to receive Christ as an eternal being but also his apostles. Since Luke (Chap. I. 2.) speaks of himself and his fellow-disciples as "eye witnesses and ministers of the word from the beginning."

3rdly. I shall now quote the interpretation of this passage by searchers after truth who have been enabled to overcome their early acquired prejudices. See Improved version for which the Christian world is indebted to its eminently learned authors. "*The word*] "Jesus is so called because God revealed himself or his word by him." Newcome. The same title

is given to Christ, Luke I. 2. For the same reason he is called the Word of life, 1 John I. 1. which passage is so clear and useful a comment upon the proem to the gospel, that it may be proper to cite the whole of it. "That which was *from the beginning*, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have *looked upon*, and our hands have handled of *the Word of life*, for *the Life* was *manifested*, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and *show* unto you, that eternal *Life* which was *with the Father*, and was manifested unto us, that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you." By a similar metonymy Christ is called the Life, the Light, the Way, the Truth, and the Resurrection. See Cappe's Dissert. vol. 1. page 19."

"*In the beginning.*] Or, from the first i. e. from the commencement of the gospel dispensation, or of the ministry of Christ. This is the usual sense of the word in the writings of this evangelist. John VI. 64, Jesus knew from the beginning, or from the first; ch. XV. 27, ye have been with me from the beginning. See ch. XVI. 14; II. 24; III. 11; also 1 John I. 1; II. 7. 8; 2 John 6, 7. Nor is this sense of the word uncommon in other passages of the New Testament, 2 Thess. II. 13; Phil. IV. 15; Luke I. 2."

"*The Word was God.*] He withdrew from the world to commune with God, and to receive divine instructions and qualifications previously to his public ministry. As Moses was with God in the mount, Exod. XXXIV. 28, so was Christ in the wilderness, or elsewhere, to be instructed and disciplined for his high and important office. See Cappe, ibid. p. 22."

"*And the Word was a God.*] "was God," Newcome. Jesus received a commission as a prophet of the Most High, and was invested with extraordinary miraculous powers. But in the Jewish phraseology they were called gods to whom the word of God came. John X. 35. So Moses is declared to be a god to Pharoah. Exod. VII. 1. Some translate the passage, God was the Word. q d. it was not so properly he that spake to men as God that spake to them by him. Cappe, ibid. See John X. 30. compared with XVII. 8, II. 16; III. 34; V. 23; XII. 44. Crellius conjectured that the true reading was Θεȣ, the Word was God's q. d. the first teacher of the gospel derived his commission from God. But this conjecture, however plausible, rests upon no authority."

"*Was in the beginning with God*] Before he entered upon his ministry he was fully instructed, by intercourse with God, in the nature and extent of his commission."

"*All things were done by him.*] "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." Newcome: who explains it of the creation of the visible material world by Christ, as the agent and instument of God. See his notes on ver. 3. and 10. But this is a sense which the word εγενετο will not admit. γινομαι occurs upwards of seven hundred times in the New Testament, but never in the sense of *create*. It signifies in this gospel, where it occurs fifty-three times, to be, to come, to become, to come to pass: also, to be done or transacted, chap. XV. 7; XIX. 36. It has the latter sense, Matt. V. 18; VI. 8; XXI. 42; XXVI. 6. All things in the Christian dispensation were done by Christ, i. e. by his authority, and according to his direction; and in the ministry committed to his apostles nothing has been done without his warrant. See John XV. 4, 5, "Without me ye can do nothing." Compare ver. 7, 10, 16; John XVII. 8; Col. I. 16, 17. Cappe, ibid."

Verse 14. "Nevertheless, the Word was flesh. "Though this first preacher of the gospel was honoured with such signal tokens of divine confidence and favour, though he was invested with so high an office, he was, nevertheless, a *mortal man*." Cappe. In this sense the word flesh is used in the preceding verse. "*Flesh*,"

says Mr. Lindsay, Sequel to the Apology. p. 136, "is frequently put for *man*." Psalm LXV. 2; Rom. III. 20. But it frequently and peculiarly stands for man as mortal; subject to infirmities and sufferings: and as such is particularly appropriated to Christ here, and in other places. 1 Tim. III. 16; Rom. I. 3; IX. 5; 1 Pet. III. 18; IV. 1. ὁ λογος σαρξ εγενετο, the Word *was* flesh, not *became* flesh, which is Newcome's translation, or, was *made* flesh, which is the common version. The most usual meaning of γινομαι is *to be*. In this sense εγενετο is used in this chapter, ver. 6; also in Luke XXIV. 19. The things concerning Iesus of Nazareth, ὁς εγενετο, who *was*, not who became a prophet. See Cappe, p. 86; and Socinus in loc."

Now my readers may judge which of these interpretations of John I. 1. is consistent wtith scriptural authority and conformable to the human understanding.

The Editor denies positively the charge of admitting three Gods, though he is in the practice of worshiping God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. I could wish to know what he would say when a Hindoo also would deny polytheism on the same principle, that if three separate persons be admitted to

make one God and those that adore them be esteemed as worshippers of one God, what objection could be advanced justly to the oneness of three hundred and thirty three million of persons in the Deity and to their worship in different emblems; for, oneness of three or of thirty millions of separate persons is equally impossible according to human experience and equally supportable by mystery alone.

The second passage of John quoted by the Editor which I have not yet noticed is John XVI 30. "Now are we sure that thou knowest all things." I admit that Jesus knows all things concerning his ministry and the execution of final judgment but not those that bear no relation to either of them as I noticed in page 119, 200, and 223, since the phrase "all things" is very often used in a definite sense, both in the old and new Testaments. In Joshua I. 17. when the people said "we hearkened to Moses in all things" they meant of course things with regard to the divine commandments. So in Matthew XVII. 11. Elias is said to have "restored all things" that is all things concerning his office as the forerunner of the Messiah. In Mark XIII. 23. Jesus said to his disciples "I have foretold you all things" of course what respected their salvation. Ephesians VI.

21. "Tychicus a beloved brother, and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to you all things" of coure belonging to their salvation. Besides, the scriptures inform us that those who devote themselves to the contemplation of the Deity are endued with the free gift of knowing all things; but from this circumstance they are not considered to be elevated to the nature of God, nor numbered as persons of the Godhead. Proverbs XXVIII. 5. "They that the seek Lord, understand *all things*" 2 Tim. II. 7. "and the Lord give thee understanding *in all things*." 2 Samuel XIV. 20. "And my Lord is wise according to the wisdom of an angel of God to know *all things* that are in the earth."

The Editor quotes Paul (page 598.) "God our saviour" and 1 Peter "the righteousness of God and our saviour Jesus Christ" and also Jude "to the only wise God our saviour." He intends perhaps to shew that as both God and Jesus are styled "Saviours" consequently Jesus is God—I have fully noticed that several others, beside Jesus, were like him appointed by God to save people from time to time and named saviours in the scriptures; but that the use of this appellation does not serve to prove the deity of any of them, vide page 64 and 67.

The Editor expresses his despite of Hindoo polytheism triumphing in his own pure profession. I wonder how it could escape the notice of the Editor that the doctrine of plurality in unity maintained by him, and that professed by Hindoos stand on the same footing, since the Editor, as well as the Hindoos, firmly declares the unity of God while at the same time both acknowledge the *plurality* of *persons* under the same Godhead, although they differ from each other in the exact number. The following passage quoted by the Editor "the Gods who have not made the heavens and the earth, shall *perish from the earth* and from under these heavens" is equally applicable to several of the divine persons of both parties.

In answer to the Editor's query, Where does the unity of mankind exist? I entreat to be allowed to ask the Editor where the unity of the Godhead exists? If he say that it is one divine nature that exists between the three sacred persons, I answer that the unity of mankind is one human nature and exists between so many individual persons.

In answer to his question, When were all mankind one even in design and will? I shall say that mankind has always been one in nature

and shall be one even in will and design, in the glorious and prosperous reign of Christ; and that present difference in will and design or in rank and situation among its persons does not preclude them from unity of nature as the Editor himself admits that "one equal in nature to another may yet be subordinate in office." Besides, we find that the will of God the Father was sometimes at variance with that of God the Son; Matthew XXVI. 39. "O my father if it be possible *let* this cup *pass* from *me*, neverthless, not as *I will* but *as thou wilt*." Mark XIV. 36. "and he (Jesus) said Abba father, all things are possible unto *thee*. *take away* this cup from me; neverthless not what *I will*, but what thou wilt."

The Editor appeals to common sense saying that "she sees around her every day" that one man "equal in nature to another is yet subordinate in office." She sees so indeed; but when she sees one man equal in nature to another, she reckons them *two* men, whether one is subordinate in office to the other or not. To this part of the evidence I beg the Editor will pay some attention. It is indeed astonishing that in all his illustrations, the Editor brings the Godhead to a level

with any genus including various species under it, but feels offended, if any one should observe this fact to him.

The Editor says (page 601.) "Nor is it true that it was the constant practice of the Saviour to pray to the Father for the power of working miracles; for he never did them in his Father's name, as was the invariable practice of the ancient prophets." In reply to this I only refer the Editor to John XI. 41. to Mark VIII. 6. where we find Jesus had actually prayed to the father in raising the dead and breaking the bread; and especially to John XI. 42. in which Jesus by saying "thou hearest me *always*" avows that during the whole period of his executing the divine commission, God *heard* his supplications, though in several instances of performing miracles, he had not used verbally the name of God, in imitation of the practice of some of the ancient prophets. See 2 Kings V. 27. in which Elisha is said to have made Gehazi a leper, without verbal supplication to God and in ch. II. 10. Elijah bestowed on Elisha his power of performing miracles, without praying verbally to the Most High. As to the Editor's assertion that "he never did them (miracles) in his Father's name" I again refer him to John X. 25. "the works that I do *in my fa-*

ther's name they bear witness of me" V. 43. "I am come in my *Father's name* and ye receive me not, if another shall come in his own name him ye will receive" Here Jesus rests his divine commission on the name of God and rejects the claims of any one who comes in his own name. He certainly sent his disciples to work miracles in his own name as the Messiah sent from God, that his apostles might procure faith in him from Jews and Gentiles, whereby they both might have their access to God through him. Matt. X. 40. 41. 42. "he that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth *me* receiveth him *that sent me.* He that *receiveth* a prophet *in the* name of a prophet *shall receive* a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man *shall receive* a righteous man's reward. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only *in the name of a disciple* verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward." These shew evidently that man should be rewarded for any act that he may perform in the name of a disciple, even in the name of a righteous man. How much more is he to be approved in the sight of God if he acts in the name of the Messiah of the Most High.

I do not wonder at the idea of Christ's empowering his apostles to work miracles when we find other prophets doing the same at their own choice as I have often noticed. The Editor says, "if it be declared in scripture that the Father created all things by and for the Son, it proves only that the Son is equal to the Father" and that the passages 'he hath given to the son to have life in himself,'-'the first born of every creature' "place the equality of the Son with the Father beyond all dispute." This must be a new mode of proof invented for the support of the trinity founded on mystery far beyond my understanding. For, if a creature's being endowed with life by, or employed as an instrument in the hands of another, puts them both on a footing of equality, then, in the Editor's estimation, the clay is equal to the potter; the rod with which Moses performed his miracles was equal to that great prophet; and Moses himself, by whom and for whom God exhibited so many wonderful works, was equal to the Deity.

CHAPTER V.

Remarks on the replies to the arguments found in Chapter the third of the Second Appeal.

The Editor now comes (P. 602) "to the last and by far the easiest part of his work," that of meeting my objections to the seven positions formerly advanced in support of the deity of Christ. The first of these is, that Jesus was possessed of ubiquity, deduced from John III. 13. "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the son of man who is in heaven." The ubiquity of Jesus is by the Editor grounded on the phrase "who is in heaven" found in the present tense while Jesus was at that time on earth. I in the first place observed in my Second Appeal (P. 32) that "this argument might perhaps carry some weight with it, were not the frequent use of the present tense in a preterite or future sense observed in the sacred writings; and were not a great number of other passages to determine that the term "is" in this instance must

be understood in the past tense: And to support this assertion I quoted several passages, a few of which the Editor has discussed, leaving the rest quite unnoticed. One of these is John VIII. 58 "Jesus said unto them, Verily, Verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am." To weaken its force the Editor says "why must this declaration, "before Abraham was I am" be taken in a preterite sense? because if it be not our author's cause dies." No, but because it would bear no sense unless thus understood "Before Abraham was, *I was.*" The Editor further says "Did the Jews however understand it thus? So far from it that they esteemed it a decided declaration of Jesus's equality with the Father and took up stones to stone him as a blasphemer." The Jews understood Jesus as declaring himself to be more ancient than Abraham, which they first inferred from his assertion "your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad" (John VIII. 56). But there is nothing in the context that can convey the least idea of the Jews having esteemed the phrase "before Abraham was, I am" a "decided declaration of Jesus's equality with the father," or of their having, in consequence, taken up stones to stone him. Nor can the circumstance of their attempt to stone Jesus be considered as a proof of

their viewing the above declaration respecting his priority to Abraham, as blasphemy against God, for they sought to slay Jesus once on account of his having healed a man on the Sabbath day, which they considered as a breach of their law and not as a claim to equality with the Deity (John. V. 16.); and they wanted again to destroy Jesus merely from his affirming "I know him, for I am from him and *he hath sent me*" (John VII. 29 and 30); and finally from motives of political safety, as far as regarded their connection with the Romans, the Jews resolved to kill him (John XI. 47 & 48 53.)

The Editor says that "Jesus himself meek and lowly as he was, although he knew precisely in what sense they understood him, rather chose to work a miracle for his own safety, than to deny his divinity." From what I have just stated and from all that I mentioned in p. 285,253 it obviously appears that neither the Jews understood his deity from the assertion "before Abraham was I am" nor was it usual with Jesus to correct them whenever they mistook his meaning. The Editor might further perceive in John V. 20 and its context, that Jesus, though charged with having a demon, omitted to correct fully their mistaken notion; and also in John VIII. 48 and 49 that on the Jews reproaching him with

being a Samaritan, and with being possessed by a demon, the saviour only denied the second and omitted to notice the former, which was the grossest charge that one Jew could ever prefer against another.

The Editor seems doubtful as to the force of the arguments he has adduced in turning the above verse to his purpose, as he thought it proper to have recourse to "the body of evidence previously adduced" in his attempt to prove "Christ's ubiquity" but my readers may be able to judge from a calm examination of this body of evidence whether or not it has any weight in proof of the ubiquity of the son.

The Editor now lays down a rule for those instances where the present tense is used in the scriptures for the past, saying "in poetry and sometimes in lively narrative, the present is with strict propriety used for the past, because the transaction is narrated as though passing before the reader's eyes" I therefore beg the Editor to explain, conformably to this rule, the instances I noticed (Second Appeal p. 32) and numerous other instances—John XI. 8 "His disciples *say* unto him" instead of "*said* unto him" 38 "Jesus *cometh* to the grave" that is *came* to the grave XIII—6. "Then *co-*

meth he to Simon Peter," that is he *came* to Simon Peter. Do these come under the denomination of poetry or lively narration? If not, the Editor's rule must fall to the ground. If the Editor insists upon their being lively narration, because the circumstances are "narrated as though passing before the readers eyes," how can we be prevented in that case from taking the assertion in John III. 11 also for a lively narration, on the same grouud that the circumstances are narrated in the verse in question "as though passing before the reader's eyes," although Jesus had in reality meant by present the past tense.

The Editor further observes that "it is a didactic discourse, on the clearness and accuracy of which depended the salvation of a man (Nicodemus) who had hazarded much in coming to Jesus for instruction." It is true that Jesus as the greatest prophet of God, (or an omniscient being according to the orthodox creed) though well aware of the slow apprehension of Nicodemus, instructed him in a language far from being clear and comprehensible to him both in the preceding and following verses. Vide v. the 3rd "Except a man *be born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God" 8th "So is every one that is *born of the spirit*."

13 "No man hath *ascended up to heaven* but he that came down from heaven, &c." 14 "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness even so must the son of man *be lifted up*" foretelling him of his death on the cross by these ambiguous words.—Nay moreover he, in his discourse with the Jews and the multitude, very often expressed his ideas in such a manner that not only the Jews but his own disciples mistook his meaning; but he always regulates his instructions as he was guided by his and our heavenly Father. It would be therefore presumptuous in us to lay down rules for his conduct maintaining that "common humanity therefore demanded that in further discourse with him, no word should be used but in it's *direct and proper sense*."

In answer to his assertion "if then, he would only tell us, how Jesus was regarded in those realms of light and truth previously to his descent on earth, he would himself settle this point." I beg to refer the Editor to such authority as no Christian can ever deny; I mean 1. Peter I. 20. "Who verily was *foreordained before the foundation of the world* but was *manifested* in these last times for you." And also to 11 Timothy I. 9. "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works,

but according to his own purpose and grace, which *was given us* in Christ Jesus *before the world began.*" If this plain explanation fall short of convincing the Editor of the real sense in which the preexistence of Jesus and of his followers was meant my endeavour to correct his notion on this head must be of no use.

In order to weaken the force of the argument I founded on John VI. 62 "the son of man ascend up where he *was before*" shewing the absense of Jesus from heaven while he was talking to men on earth, the Editor quotes Genesis XI. 5 XVIII. 33 XXXV. 13 in which Jehovah is stated to have moved from one place to another though possessed of Omnipresence. But the Editor overlooked, or thought it judicious to omit to notice, the real point of my argument, in the Second Appeal which I now repeat "for, the attribute of Omnipresence is quite inconsistent with the human notions of the ascent and descent effected by the *son of man*" It is not impossible for the Omnipresent God that he should manifest himself wherever he chooses, without violating his Omnipresence; but the notion of occupying two very distant places at one time by a *son of man* is of course contrary to the ideas acquired by human experience, unless this extraordinary circumstance be ascribed

to the power of performing miracles bestowed on man by God.

Jesus however took every precaution in wording his discourse with Nicodemus by the use of the term *man* in the very same verse 13th, thus establishing his humanity; but notwithstanding this the prejudices of a great number of his followers have induced them to infer his ubiquity and thereby his deity from the same verse.

I will not recur to the examination of such passages as "who made all things" "who upholds all things &c." alluded to here by the Editor, having often noticed them in the former part of this work.

Let us now come to the real point and ascertain whether or not the word in the original Greek which is rendered "is" in the English version in the phrase "who is in heaven" actually signifies the present tense, as a candid inquiry into this very point will bring us to a satisfactory decision at once. The word in the original is ων a participle and not a verb, and all that I said in my Second Appeal may be compressed into three remarks. In the first place that the time of the participle is referred to the time of the verb found in the sentence, and to corrobate this

opinion I quoted Bishop Middleton's doctrine of the Greek article Part 1 Page 42 Note. "We are to refer the time of the participle to the time of the act &c. implied in the verb; for, past present and future cannot be meant otherwise than in respect of that act*" and I also cited John I. 48 Οντα ειδον σε "I saw thee when thou wast," literally "I saw thee being," in which the present participle implies the past in correspondence with the verb ειδον, or "I saw," found in the same verse. I now also beg the attention of the Editor to the common usage of almost all the languages that have the use of a present participle, in which he will find the participles generally referring to the time of the verb related to it. In English, for example, in the following phrase ("being ill, I could not call upon you") the time of the present participle "being" refers, I presume, to the verb "could not call" implying the past tense.

In the second place I quoted Leviticus Ch. VII. 23; XIV. 47, in which the present participle is accompanied with the definite article, ob-

* The Editor has given in p. 607 a quotation from Bishop Middleton, with some remarks of his own, but I am perfectly willing to leave it to the discerning reader to judge whether it corroborates my opinion or makes against it.

serving that " these present participles are referred to a time present with respect to the act of the verbs connected with them, but future with respect to the command of God ;" that is, when the definite article is prefixed in Greek to a present participle, it has reference to the verb connected with it in an indefinite manner. So we find many instances in the New Testament similar to those quoted from Leviticus. In the third place I said: " Moreover, we frequently find the present participle used in a past tense even without reference to the time of the verb: John XI. 25 τυφλος ων αρτι βλεπω " being blind, now I see; " that is " Having been blind, now I see."

The Editor omitting to notice the second and third arguments adduced by me, makes remarks only on the first, saying, that " were this criticism (" being in heaven" instead of " is in heaven ") perfectly correct, it would not be of the least service to our author, as he being in heaven, is precisely the same as he who is in heaven."—I positively object to the accuracy of this assertion of the Editor, for the verb " is," generally affirms an act or a state at the time present when spoken ; but the present participle ων, or " being" even when preceded by the definite article ὁ or " the," implies time indefinitely, though the article ὁ is often rendered by a rela-

tive pronoun "who" or "which" and the participle by a verb, for the sake of elegance in English composition. I beg to refer the Editor first to those texts quoted in my Second Appeal. Leviticus VII. 23 ὁ προσφερων—αυτῳ εσται ὁ βραχιων ὁ δεξιος "The offering (person,) for him shall be the right shoulder." Although the participle "offering" is found here in the present tense, yet it indisputably implies, that at any time in future in which the offering may be made, "the offerer shall be entitled to the right shoulder" Lev. XIV. 47 ὁ εσθων—πλυνειτα ιματια αυτου. "The eating (person) shall wash his clothes." The word "eating" though found here in the present participle, preceded by the definite Greek article ὁ signifies any part of the future in which the act of eating shall take place. The phrase "*the eating* (person") is rendered in the English version, "he that eateth," conformably to the idiom of the English language; but this change of construction does not produce any change in the real meaning conveyed by the original Greek. As this phrase "he that eats," bears no allusion to the support of the doctrine of the Trinity, no one will, I presume, scruple to interpret it in its original sense; that is, he who eats at any time future with respect to the commandment of God, shall wash his clothes.

Secondly, I refer the Editor to the passages he quoted in p. 608 to save me the trouble of selecting them: John III. 4. "How can a man be born when he is old," literally "being old;" that is, at any point of time, no man being old can be born: v. 15 "that no man believing on him should perish" that is, no one who may be induced to believe Jesus at any time even up to the last day should perish 18. "He not believing is condemned already;" that is, he who rejects me at any time is condemned already in the divine decree 20 "Every one doing evil hateth light" at any time whatsoever. 29 "He having the bride is the bridegroom" at any period of time. 31—"He being of the earth is earthly" at any period of time: Again Ch. V. 3 "In these lay a great multitude of folk impotent" &c. In the original Greek the verb "to lie" is in the imperfect tense and consequently the participle may be thus rendered "who were impotent up to that time." 5.—"And a certain man was there who had an infirmity thirty and eight years." In this verse the participle is not preceded by the article: This however signifies that a certain man had an infirmity when he was present at the pool—not at the time when St. John narrated this circumstance.—But with a view to expose my argument to ridicule, the Editor puts his own words into my mouth, saying

(P. 608) "In this Chapter v. 4 we have 'how can a man be born when he is old' literally 'being old' on our author's plan 'having been old and now not being so;" and so on in all the above stated verses. But I wonder how he could mistake what I have advanced in my Second Appeal in explanation of a present participle preceded by the article ὁ in the following words: "The offering (person) for him shall be the right shoulder: —the eating (person) shall wash his clothes. These present participles are referred to a time present with respect to the act of the verbs connected with them, but future with respect to the command of God." Now, my reader may judge whether I confined the meaning of a present participle to the past tense as the Editor, no doubt inadvertently, misrepresents my arguments.

Thirdly. I beg to refer the Editor to the translation of that verse by the celebrated Dr. Campbell. "For none ascendeth into heaven, but he who descended from heaven, the son of man whose abode is heaven" in which the sense of the participle is referred to an indefinite time; for, a person whose abode is in London, may have his temporary residence in Paris.

Fourthly. I beg also to refer to the explanation of the article ὁ before a participle, given by Park-

hurst " XI. with a participle it may generally be rendered by *who, that, which,* and the participle as a verb. Thus 1 John II. 4 ὁ λεγων he who saith i. e. the (person) saying. John I. 18 ὁ ων *who is or was.* "

As to the assertion of the Editor that were the time of the participle " being" found in the phrase " being in heaven" referred to the verb " to ascend up to heaven," it would completely prove the ubiquity of Christ or involve perfect absurdity, I presume there would be neither of these difficulties, in the event of the participle being referred to the verb mentioned in the verse; for, one's being in heaven or having his abode in heaven does not render his ascent to heaven impossible, nor does it tend to prove his deity. Let us apply these circumstances as they stand literally to Moses and Elias, who descended from their heavenly abode and appeared with Jesus Christ to his apostles; Mathew XVII. 3 and again ascended, would it prove their ubiquity or involve absurdity? But is there any thing more absurd than an attempt to prove the ubiquity of a son of man capable of occupying only a certain small space on earth?

In reply to his assertion, that " when John wishes to describe a past state of action or being,

he chuses some past participle." I only beg to remind him, that in the Greek language there is no past or future participle for the verb ειμι *to be*, and consequently the present participle is used for those tenses under the specific rules.*

As to the second passage which he quoted to demonstrate the ubiquity of Jesus (Mathew XVIII. 20 " for where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them") I observed in my Second Appeal " Is it not evident that the Saviour meant here by being in the midst of two or three of his

* The true explanation of the verse is given in the IMPROVED VERSION as follows: " Now no man hath ascended up to heaven but he who came down from heaven† even the Son of Man [who is in heaven.]‡

† *He who came down from heaven.*] This clause is correlative to the preceding. If the former is to be understood of a local ascent, the latter must be interpreted of a local descent, But if the former clause is to be understood figuratively, as Raphelius and Doddridge explain it, the latter ought in all reason to be interpreted figuratively likewise. If " to ascend into heaven," signifies to become acquainted with the truths of God, " to descend from heaven," is to bring down, and to discover those truths to the world. And this text clearly explains the meaning of the phrase, wherever it occurs in this evangelist. "Coming down from heaven" means coming from God, (see ver. 2) as Nicodemus expressed it, who did not understand this of a local descent, but of a divine commission. So Christ interprets it ver. 17" Sn.

‡ *Who is in heaven*] This clause is wanting in some of the best copies. If its authenticity is allowed, it is to be understood of the knowledge which Christ possessed of the Father's will. See John I. 18.

disciples, his guidance of them when joined in searching for the truth, without preferring any claim to ubiquity?—We find similar expressions in the scriptures wherein the guidance of the prophets of God is meant by words that would imply their presence. Luke XVI. 29 "Abraham said unto him, They have Moses and Prophets, let them hear them." No one will suppose that this expression is intended to signify that the Jews actually had Moses and the prophets in person among them,—or that they could hear them speak in the literal sense of the words; nor can any one deduce the omnipresence of Moses and the prophets from such expressions."

The Editor, to avoid entering into the main argument puts the following questions to which I shall now reply. "1st. If Christ guided them, must he not have been with them for that purpose?" Yes, he has been with them in the same manner as Moses and the prophets have been with the Israelites, as is evident from the above quoted passage of Luke; as well as from another which I shall now cite. I. John III. 24. "And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him and he in him, and hereby we know that he *abideth in us by the spirit which he hath given us.*" 2dly If there were only two such little companies searching for the *truth* at the

same moment, must he not have possessed ubiquity to guide them both?" I reply, by two other questions.—If the Jews of Galilee and of Jerusalem "have Moses and the Prophets" at the same time for their guidance, are Moses and the Prophets to be supposed to have been possessed of ubiquity? After Elijah went up to heaven (2 Kings II—11) and his spirit was seen resting on Elisha who remained on earth (15), does the circumstance of Elijah's being in heaven and being with his servant Elisha on earth in spirit at the same time, prove the ubiquity of Elijah? 3rdly The Editor asks, "If he (Jesus) was with Christians to guide them, has he left them now?" I reply, neither Jesus nor Moses and the Prophets have now forsaken those that sincerely search into truth and are not fettered with early acquired human opinions. 4th. "How then can he be the same yesterday, to-day and forever." My reply is, he has been the same in like manner as David has been, in "keeping the law continually *forever and ever*" (Psalm CXIX—44, 5th. "Does our author need to be told that this meant the writings of Moses and the Prophets." I reply, that this expression means their words preserved forever by means of writing as the statutes of God. Psalm CXIX 152 "Concerning thy testimonies I have known of old that thou hast founded them forever."

89 "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven;" and Deut. XXXII. 1 Moses exclaims "Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak, and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth; my doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew" &c. 6th. "Did Jesus mean that they had his writings with them?" I reply, he meant of course that they had his lowly spirit, and his words which were afterwards published and preserved in writing. 7th. "Where were the writings of Jesus at that time?" I said not a word of his writings in my Second Appeal: why the Editor puts this question to me I know not. It is however evident that Jesus himself while on earth, like other prophets of God, never omitted to express his doctrines and precepts, which have been handed down in writing up to this day.

SECOND POSITION.

The Editor quoted Mathew XI 27. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him,"—to shew that Jesus ascribes to himself a knowledge and an incomprehensibility of nature equal to that of God. I consequently asked the Editor in my Second Appeal "if he, by the term 'in-

comprehensible," understands a total impossibility of being comprehended in any degree, or only the impossibility of attaining to a perfect knowledge of God? If the former, we must be under the necessity of denying such a total incomprehensibility of the Godhead; for the very passage cited by the Editor declares God to be comprehensible not to the Son alone; but also to every one who should receive revelation from the Son—and in John XVI. 16 and 17, Jesus ascribes to his disciples a knowledge of the Holy Ghost whom the Editor considers one of the persons of the Godhead, possessed of the same nature with God.—But if the Editor understands by the passage he has quoted the incomprehensibility of the real nature of the Godhead; I admit the position, but deny his inference that such an incomprehensibility proves the nature of the object to be divine, as being peculiar to God alone, for it appears evident that a knowledge of the real nature even of a common leaf or a visible star surpasses human comprehension. The Editor although he filled one page (610) in examining that part of the reply, yet made no direct answer to the foregoing question but repeats his inference from these passages, " that Jesus himself can comprehend the nature of the Father and that his own nature is equally inscrutable, but the verse in question does not con-

vey one or other of these positions. As to the first, we find the latter part of the sentence ("neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him") declaring an exception to the general assertion, made in the former part of it: ("neither knoweth any man the Father") that is, the Son and those to whom the Son reveals God, were the only individuals that knew the nature of the Father. Would not this exception be distinctly contrary both to the sacred authorities and to common sense? As the scripture declares positively that the nature of God is incomprehensible to men.—Job XXXVI 26 "God is great, we know him not;" and common sense teaches us every moment that if the real nature of the works of God is incomprehensible to the human intellect, how much more must the nature of God himself be beyond human understanding? As to the second, if the circumstance of the Son's declaring himself (according to the Editor) to be inscrutable in nature, be acknowledged as equalizing him with God, similar declarations by his Apostles would of course raise them to the same footing of equality with the deity. I John III. 1 "Therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not," coroborated by John XVII 25 "O righteous Father; the world hath not known thee" &c. It is therefore evi-

dent that neither can an impossibility of comprehending God, in any degree, be meant by this passage, the apostles having known God by revelation; nor can the comprehension of the real nature of God be understood by it, as such a knowledge is declared to be unattainable by mankind. The verse in question must be thus understood; as the meaning evidently is, "that no one but the Father can fully comprehend the object and extent of the Son's commission, and no one but the Son comprehends the counsels and designs of the Father with respect to the instruction and reformation of mankind, it is impossible that Jesus can be speaking here of the person and nature of the Father; for this he did not, and could not reveal, being essentially incomprehensible. Neither, therefore, does he mean the nature and person of the Son. What Christ knew and revealed "was the Father's will" corresponding to this; that which the Father and the Father only knew, was the nature and extent of the Son's commission" IMPROVED VERSION.

THIRD POSITION.

As the Editor expressed his opinion that "Jesus exercised in an independent manner the prerogative of forgiving sin, which is peculiar to God, founding this opinion upon the authori-

ty of Mark II. 5 Matthew IX. 2 "Thy sins be forgiven thee" I enquired in my Second Appeal "Does not this passage ("But when the multitude saw it, they marvelled and glorified God who had given such power unto men," Matthew IX. 8) convey an express declaration that Jesus was as much dependent on God in exercising the power of forgiving sins and healing the sick as the other prophets who came forth from God before him?" To which the Editor replies "we answer; only in the opinion of the multitude who knew him not, but took him, for a great prophet."

I feel surprized at the assertion of the Editor that it was the ignorant multitude who knew not of the nature of Jesus that made the following declaration "who had given such power to men"; since it is the Holy Spirit which speaks by the mouth of the Evangelist Matthew saying "when the *multitude* saw it *they* marvelled and *glorified* God who had given such power unto men."

I wonder how the Editor could allow his zeal in support of the Trinity so far to bias his mind that he has attempted to weaken the authority of the Holy Evangelist by ascribing his words to the ignorant multitude of Jews. I wonder still

more to observe, that notwithstanding the Editor declares the apostles and primitive Christians, (whom he does not esteem as persons of the Godhead, but admits to be mere men), to have been possessed of the power of pardoning sins through the influence of Jesus, yet he maintains the opinion that none except God can forgive sins even through the gift of the deity himself.

The Editor says "Not however in the opinion of the scribes who were better acquainted with their own scriptures and who although they glorified him not as God, could not restrain themselves from acknowledging the display of his Godhead by accusing him of blasphemy on that very account."

The Jews were so ill-disposed towards Jesus that this is not the first instance in which they sought a pretence for destroying him under the charge of blasphemy; for in John V. 16 they resolve to slay him merely on pretence of his having healed a man on the sabbath day as I noticed before; and in chapter XII. 10-11 they came to a determination under the cloak of religion to kill him and Lazarus also whom Jesus raised after death, though they knew that many of their prophets raised the dead, without offending God or the people. And they also very fre-

quently mistook his meaning. But Jesus often forbore to repel their charges, some instances of which I have already pointed out in page 252. As to Jesus's knowledge of the human heart as far as it respects his divine commission and future judgement and his power of performing miraculous deeds even sometimes without verbal reference to God, having often noticed these matters in p. 109 & 221 I shall not recur to them here.

The Editor denies the apostles, having been impressed with a belief that it was the almighty Father that empowered Jesus to forgive sins and to perform miracles. I therefore refer the Editor to the very phrase "who had given such power unto men" and to Acts XXXII.32 "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a prince and a saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins" (XIII 38) "thro' this *man* (meaning the Saviour) is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins," Do not these verses shew beyond a doubt that Jesus received from God the power of forgiving sins on sincere repentance?

The Editor makes no direct answer to Luke XXIII 34, in which Jesus prays to the father for the pardon of the murder perpetrated by the Jews upon him, nor to Luke XI. 4. Matthew VI. 14, which I quoted in my Second Ap-

peal page 40. The Editor alludes to the importance of the expression "that thy son may glorify thee." But by referring to the scriptures he will find that similar terms are as common in the language of the Jews in their address to God as any other expressions of reverence for the deity.

FOURTH POSITION.

With a view to substantiate his fourth position that Almighty power is claimed by Jesus in the most unequivocal manner, the Editor thus comments on the passage John V. 19.—36. quoted by me in my Second Appeal. "Jesus, when persecuted by the Jews for having healed a man on the sabbath day, said, 'my Father worketh hitherto, and I work.' This provoked the Jews still more, because he had now said that God was his father, making himself equal with God". The Editor adds, "this observation shews us that not only the Jews but John himself understood Christ's calling God his Father, to be making *himself God.*" It would have been a correct translation of the original Greek, if the Editor had said. "making himself equal with, or like God," instead of "making himself God" (vide the original Greek). It is obvious that one's calling another his Father gives apparent ground to understand that there is an equality of nature

or likeness of properties between them, either in quantity or quality of power in performing works. But to know what kind of equality or likeness should be meant in Ch. V. 18. we have luckily before us the following texts, in which Jesus declares, that his likeness with God consisted in doing what he saw the Father do, and quickening the dead; avowing repeatedly at the same time his inferiority to and dependence on God, in so plain a manner that the Jews who heard him, abstained from the measures of persecution that they had intended to adopt, although the Saviour continued to call God his Father through the whole of the remaining chapter in the hearing of the Jews. Nay, further, from the whole of his conduct and instructions so impressed were the Jews with his dependence upon and confidence in the Father as his God, that when he was hanging on the cross they fixed upon this as a ground of taunt and reproach saying "He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him, for he said 'I am the Son of God," Matt. XXVII. 43.

The Editor then proceeds to say, "this (charge of equality) Jesus neither denies nor corrects, but adds 'the son can do nothing of himself but what he seeth the Father do' which must necessarily be the case, if, as our author

affirms, the Father and the Son are one in will and design." I ask the Editor, whether this be the language of one who is Almighty? If the Father and the Son be equally Almighty, why should the Son wait until the Father acts and then imitate him? If a subordinate officer having been accused of equalizing himself with his superior, thus declares "I cannot march a single step myself, but where I see him march, I do march,"—would this be considered an avowal of his equality with his superior? My readers will be pleased to judge. The Editor then says that "Jesus adds further, 'for whatever things he doth, these also doth the Son likewise,' a more full declaration of equality with the Father cannot be imagined: How could the Son do whatsoever the Father doth, if he were not equal to him in power, wisdom, truth, mercy, &c." The Editor here omits to quote the very next line "FOR the Father loveth *the Son* and *sheweth* him all things that himself doth" in which the preposition "for" assigns reasons for the Son's doing what the Father doth i. e. since the Father loveth the son and sheweth him his works, the Son is enabled to do what he sees the Father do. To the Editor's query "what finite being could understand all that God doth, if shewn him?" I reply: divine wisdom will of course not show any thing to one whom it has

not previously enabled toc omprehend it. How could the following passages escape the memory of the Editor when he put the question: *Amos* III. 7. "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but revealeth his secret unto his servants the Prophets" *Psalm* XXV. 14. "The *secret* of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will *shew them* his covenant." Did not they understand all that was shewn and revealed unto them? If they did, were they, in consequence, all infinite beings; as the Editor argues from this circumstance Jesus is!

The Editor proceeds to say, "Jesus adds, 'For as the Father quickeneth the dead, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will, Here then he declares himself equal with the Father in sovereignty of will, as well as in almighty power." The Editor again omits a part of the sentence which runs thus:—"So the Son quickeneth whom he will; F O R the Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." Does not the latter part of the sentence shew clearly that the power which the Son enjoyed in quickening those whom he chose, was entirely owing to the commission given him by the Father? In order to weaken the force of verse 22nd. the Editor says, "the Father however, whose it is equally

with the Son, commits all judgment to the Son as the incarnate mediator between God and man, because he is the son of man." My readers may observe that if Jesus received all power of judging men in his human nature, he must have quickened whom he pleased as the consequence of that power in his human capacity; how, then, could the Editor infer the deity of Jesus from one circumstance, (quickening the dead) which entirely depends upon another (the power of judging) enjoyed by him in his human nature. Lest it should be supposed that individual instances of the dead being raised by Jesus is here meant, I may just mention that he exercised this power in common with other Prophets.

As to his assertion that the work of judging mankind belongs by nature equally to the Son and to the Father, I only refer the Editor to Matthew XIX. 28 and Luke XXII. 36. 30. in which the apostles are represented as invested with the power of judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel and to 1 Cor. VI. 2. which ascribes the power of judging the world to righteous men; and I hope that the Editor will be convinced from these authorities that the "work of judging mankind" does not "belong by nature to the Son and to the Father." He introduces in

the course of this argument John VIII. 58. and Rev. 1. 8. which I have often examined in the preceding pages, 310. 150.

He at last comments on verse 23, "that all men should honour the Son as they honour the Father" saying that, "to this glorious declaration of the Son's Godhead, our author merely objects that this means likeness in nature and quality, and not in exact degree of honour. But what are the nature and quality of the honour paid to God the Father? divine honour of the highest kind and such as can be given to no creature?" The pharses "to honour God" and "to adore God" are used in quite different senses; the latter being peculiarly applicable to God, but the former generally implying only such manifestation of reverence as one may bestow on his Father or on another worthy of respect. Malachi I. 6. "A son honoureth his father and a servant his master; if then I be *a Father* where is mine honour" &c. Here God requires the same kind of honour to be paid him as is due to a Father. Does God here bring himself, in consequence, to a level with a parent? 1 Samuel II. 30. "But now the Lord saith. Be it far from me; for them that honour me, I will honour."—Here the manifestation of honour between God and men is reciprocal; but in any

sense whatsoever no worship can be reciprocally offered by God and his creatures. The Editor again advances that "the fact is that this phrase "*as*" really refers to degree as well as to nature; see Mathew XX. 14. 'I will give unto this last even as unto thee' that is, precisely as much as one penny." I deny the accuracy of this rule of the Editor, since "as" in almost all instances refers either to degree or nature or to some kind of resemblance, a few of which I shall here notice, Gal. IV. 15. Paul says to the Galatians, "but received me *as an angel of* God even *as Christ Jesus.*" Did Paul permit the Galations to receive him with precisely the same kind of honour both in kind and degree as was due to Christ Jesus? Matthew X. 25. "It is enough for the disciple that he *be as his master* and the servant as his Lord," &c. Did Matthew mean here precise equality in kind and degree between a disciple and his master, and a servant and his Lord? XIX. 19. "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Did the Saviour mean here that precisely the same quality and degree of love which one entertains towards himself should be entertained towards others? Genesis III. 22. "Behold the man is become *as* one of us." Did Adam then become both in nature and degree equally wise with the Omniscient God? Now my readers

will judge whether or not such a phrase as "man should or may honour the Son as they honour the Father" equalizes the Son in nature and degree with the Father? As to the verse above quoted (Matthew XX. 14). It implies sameness in degree and not necessarily sameness in kind, for the same sum may be given in different currency. The Editor quotes *Heb.* III. 3. 4. in order to shew "in what sense the Prophet to be sent was like Moses." As I examined this verse in page 153 I will not recur to it again. I only remind the Editor of Deut. XVIII. 15. and 18, where he will perceive in what sense Jehovah himself drew a likeness between the Saviour and Moses, which passage is repeated in Acts III. 22. and also of St. Matthew XVII. 3. as well as of Mark IX. 4. wherein they express a wish to manifest the same reverence to the Saviour as to Moses and Elias, but it is quite optional with the Editor to treat Moses in any manner he pleases.

In answer to his inquiry "why should it offend our author, that when the Son for the suffering of death took upon him the form of a servant," &c. my reply is that it does not offend me in the least; but I must confess that such an expression as when God "for the suffering of death took upon him the form of a servant,"

seems to me very extraordinay, as my idea of God is quite at variance with that of a being subjected to death and servitude.

The Editor overlooked several other passages quoted by me among which there was Matthew XX. 23 "to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give but to them for whom it is prepared of my Father."

He perhaps hesitated to rely on the sophistry used by the orthodox, that Jesus denied being possessed of Almighty power only in his human capacity: The Editor, it is possible, perceived that as the *gift* of all power to Jesus, mentioned in Matt. XXVIII. 18, is explained by the orthodox of his human capacity; the *denial* of almighty power could not therefore be understood of that *very human nature* in which he is said to have possessed it.

FIFTH POSITION.

The Editor says that "our author's objections to the fifth position that Jesus's having all judgement committed to him, proves his omniscience, have been so fully met already that scarcely any thing remains to be added."

In answer to which, I have only to say that the arguments adduced by the Editor having been previously noticed, it is therefore left to my readers to examine them and to come to a

determination whether they tend to prove the omniscience of the Son or not. The Editor however adds here, that omniscience is essential to the act of judging mankind: as I have already dwelt much on this subject in the preceding paragraph page 136 and also in page 191, I beg to refer my readers to them, wherein they will find that the Son's knowledge of the events of this world extends no farther than as respects the office of judging mankind; that others are declared to be vested with the power of judging the world as well as the Son; and that the Son positively denies his omniscience in Mark XIII. 32 The Editor concludes by saying, that "his (Father's) giving him 'to have life in himself' refers wholly to his being the mediator in human flesh." It settles the question at once that whenever and in whatever capacity Jesus is declared to have had life, he had it as a gift of the Father, and the object of our inquiry and reverence is the Son endowed with life and not one destitute of it.

SIXTH POSITION.

The Editor begins by observing that "to the sixth position that Jesus accepted worship due to God alone, our author objects, 'that the word "worship" both in common acceptation and scriptural writings, is used sometimes as imply-

ing an external mark of religious reverence paid to God, and at other times as signifying merely the token of civil respect due to superiors; that those who worshipped Jesus did not believe him to be God or one of the three persons of the Godhead, and Jesus in his acknowledged human capacity, never prayed to himself or directed his followers to worship or pray to him: 'Granting that "worship" in English and προσκυνέω in Greek are sometimes used to denote civil respect and that the worship paid by the servant to his master Matthew Ch. XVIII. 26. and by the people to David meant merely civil respect, still the position is not touched in the least degree." The reason which the Editor assigns for this position not being touched, is that "whether the blind man, the lepers, the mariners and others, knew what they did in worshipping Jesus, is not so much the question, as whether Jesus knew; for if he suffered them even through ignorance, to yield him divine worship, when Peter did not suffer it in Cornelius for a moment, unless he were God, he must have had less discernment or less piety and concern for the divine honour than his own disciples." P. 618.

As the Editor agrees that the term "worship in English and προσκυνέω in Greek are sometimes used to denote civil respect," it is of course

necessary to ascertain whether the blind man &c. knew what they did in worshipping Jesus: that is, whether they meant to bestow civil respect or to offer religious reverence. But from all the local circumstances which I pointed out in the Second Appeal P. 49. it is evident that they as well as Jesus knew that they were manifesting civil respect only by worshipping him, in the same way as it is evident, from the circumstances of David's not declining to receive worship from the people, and Daniel from King Nebuchadnezzar, that the people and King intended merely civil respect to them. As to Peter's rejection of the worship offered him by Cornelius, it may easily be accounted for, since as Jesus was endowed with the power of knowing things connected with his divine commission; so Peter had the knowledge of secret events concerning his apostolic duty. From the language which the blind man and others used and from his knowledge of their thoughts, the Saviour like other ancient prophets gave a tacit consent to the worship (or properly speaking civil reverence) offered by them, while Peter rejected the worship offered him by Cornelius, knowing that he meant it as an external mark of religious reverence, which was due to God alone, as is evident from the language of Peter, "I myself am a man." Having already noti-

ced the exclaimation of Thomas in page 290 & Heb. I. 10. in page 122, I shall not recur to the subject in this place.

The Editor says "was Stephen (ignorant) when he committed to him his departing soul in language similar to that in which Christ on the cross had committed his spirit to the Father?" The language of Stephen alluded to by the Editor and that of Christ bears little resemblance. Among the many expressions attributed to Jesus on the cross, none of them resemble the invocation of Stephen, except that given Luke XXIII. 46. "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit" which is natural for every human being having any idea of God or feelings of devotion on the approach of death. Stephen's exclamation (Acts VII. 59. "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit") was merely an application to Jesus in preference to the Angels of death, whom he expected to receive his soul and convey it to the bosom of the divinity. The notion of Angels of death receiving and conveying away the spirit at the time of dissolution is familiar to the Jews, in common with other Eastern nations, as appears from their traditions and from Proverbs XVI. 14. "The wrath of a King is as messengers (in the Hebrew, properly angels") of death. i. e. in a despotic country, the displeasure of the tyrant is equivalent to death. From

Stephens saying that he saw "the *son of man standing* on the right hand of God," we may easily perceive the notion which he had formed of the nature of Jesus Christ.

As to Christ's offering prayers and worship to the Father and directing his Apostles to do so, the Editor attributes, them to the "state of humiliation, on which his infinite love to sinners had placed him." If Jesus deemed it necessary in his human capacity to offer up prayers, thanks giving and worship to God the Father alone, notwithstanding he was *filled* bodily with God the Son (according to the Editor) and direct his apostles to follow his example; is it not incumbent upon us also in following his pattern to thank, pray to, and worship the Father *alone* as long as *we* are human? But the truth is that the assertion of the Editor, attributing Christ's devotion towards God to his human nature is entirely unsupported by scriptural authority.

The Editor further says that if Jesus were not God, the apostles, the primitive saints, and the angels in heaven would be guilty of idolatry and the eternal Father of encouraging it.

To quit the Father and Jesus Christ of the charge of encouraging Idolatory and the apos-

tles and the Saints and the Angels of the sin of Idol worship, it suffices to quote Matthew IV. 10.

αυτῳ μονῳ λατρευσεις. "Him only shalt thou serve." This commandment of the Father of the universe to be found in Deut. VI. repeated and communicated to Christians by the most exalted among the Prophets (who enjoins religious adoration to be offerred to the Father *alone*), sufficiently vindicates God and his Christ from the above charge. The apostles so strictly observed this divine communication through their master, under the Christian dispensation, that throughout the *whole* New Testament they applied exclusively to *God alone* this verb, λατρευω (rendered in the English Version "*to serve*") and not once to Jesus or to any other being in any book of the New Testament, while on similar occasions they used for him or others the verbs δουλευω or διακονεω rendered also in the English Version "*to serve*" which tends no less to vindicate them. They further pronounce those who *serve* (from the verb λατρευω) any one except God, to be rebels and idolators: Rom. I. 25. Act VII. 42. I now intreat the Editor to examine the subject and by following the example of the apostles and primitive saints glorify a religion intended to be raised far above the debasement of idolatry.

THE SEVENTH & LAST POSITION.

The Editor having attempted to prove the Deity of the Son and the personality of the Holy Ghost from the circumstance of their names being associated with that of the Father of the universe, I observed in my Second Appeal that "a profession of belief in God is unquestionably common to all religions supposed to have been founded upon the authority of the Old Testament; but each is distinguished from the other by a public profession of faith in their respective founders, expressing such profession in a language that may clearly exhibit the inferior nature of those founders to the divine Being, of whom they declare themselves the messengers." "The Jews claim that they have revelation rendering a belief not in God alone but in Moses also incumbent upon them. Exodus XIV. 31. 'The people feared the Lord and believed the Lord and his servant Moses' (to which Jesus also refers in John V. 45. 'There is one that accuseth you, even Moses in whom ye *trust*') "If baptism were administered to one embracing Christianity, in the name of the Father and Holy spirit, he would thereby no more become enrolled as a Christian than as a Jew or a Mohummudan; for both of them in common with Christians would readily submit to be baptized in the name of God or his Prevailing

influence over the universe." I afterwards added in the discussion respecting the Holy-Spirit that, "God is invariably represented in revelation as the main object of belief, receiving worship and prayers that proceed from the heart through the first-born of every creature, the Messiah ('no man cometh unto the Father but by me') and leading such as worship him in spirit to righteous conduct and ultimately to salvation through his guiding influence which is called the Holy-spirit, ('when he thes pirit of truth is come he will guide you unto all truth'). There is therefore a moral obligation on those who avow the truth of such revelatiou to profess their belief in God as the sole object of worship, and in the Son, through whom they, as Christians, should offer divine homage, and also in the holy influence of God, from which they should expect direction in the paths of righteousness, as the consequence of their sincere prayer and supplication. For the same reason also, in publicly adopting this religion, it is proper that those who receive it should be baptized in the name of the Father who is the object of worship, of the Son who is the mediator, and of that influence by which spiritual blessings are conveyed to mankind, designated in scripture, as the comforter, spirit of truth, or holy spirit." And to prove the error of the idea that the association of names

of individuals with that of God in a religious profession or belief, which is more essential than any external mark of profession, could identify or equalize those individuals with God, I quoted Exodus XIV. 30. which I have just repeated and 2nd. Chro. XX. 20. "Jehoshaphat stood and said, hear me O Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem; believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his Prophets so shall ye prosper," wherein the names of Moses and the Prophets of God are associated with that of the deity. Besides, I observed to the Editor, that fire-worshippers, for instance, insisting on the literal sense of the words, in example of the Rev. Editor, might refer to that text in the third chapter of Matthew, repeated in Luke III. 16. in which it is announced that Jesus "will baptize with the holy ghost and with fire:" and they might contend that if the association in the rite of baptism of the names of the Son and Holy Ghost with that of the Father be supposed to prove their divinity, it is clear that Fire also being associated with the Holy Ghost in the same rite, must likewise be considered as a part of the Godhead." He keeps all these arguments out of view, and according to his usual mode of reasoning, repeats again in his reply what he thought the purport of Hebrew I. 10. Rev. II. 29. and has recourse again to the angel of Bochim, &c. which

having no relation to the subject in question, and having been often examined in the preceding pages, I shall pass by here. His only remark concerning this last position is, that "had the passage (respecting *belief in God and his servant Moses)* quoted from Exodus XIV. 31. been *that* formulary, instead of being a part of a narrative,—the omission in the baptismal rite of the clause "his Servant" would have been fatal to his objection.—If then the phrase "his servant" marks the inferior nature of this messenger of God, the omission of it in the circumstances just mentioned unavoidably proves the equality of the Father and the Son, &c." In the first place, it is too obvious to need proof that every circumstance mentioned in the Sacred Scriptures even in the form of narrative, if approved of God, is worthy of attention though not stated in the formulary of a religious rite. But in the second place, the passage quoted by me from 2nd. Chronicles, is a commandment enjoining belief in God and his Prophets, even with the omission, so much desired by our Editor, of the term "his *servants.*" Does this formulary, I ask, with the omission of the term "his *servants*" prove the equality of the Father and the Prophets from the circumstance of their being associated with God in a solemn religious injunction?

In the third place, the term "Son" equally with the word "Servant" denotes the inferiority of Jesus as plainly as any expression intended to denote inferiority can possibly do. But the Editor says, that "never was there a more humble begging of the question than the assertion that the epithet 'Son' ought to be understood and admitted by every one as expressing the created nature of Christ; why ought it thus to be understood and admitted?" I answer, because common sense tells us that a Son as well as a Servant must be acknowledged to be inferior to his Father or Master. Again, we find David called the Son of God, Solomon the Son of God, Adam the Son of God, and in short the whole children of Israel denominated "Sons of God;" yet represented in scripture as inferior to God their Father; nay, moreover, Jesus the Son of God positively declares himself to be inferior to his Father—"My Father is greater than I."

Our Editor puts again another query (p. 622) "Can he even prove that among men a Son must be of a nature inferior to his Father?" I reply by putting another question to him. Can the Editor ever prove that among men a servant *must be* of a nature inferior to his master? If he cannot, are we to suppose Moses a

servant of God equal in nature with the deity? The fact is that among men a Servant, a Son, and a Grandson, are of the same nature with their Masters or Fathers; but when creation is not effected in the ordinary course of nature, there need not be and is not, an identity of nature between one who is called Father and another called Son; so when service is performed by *men* to others not of their own kind, oneness of nature is not necessarily found between the Servant and the person served.

The Editor concludes the proposition saying that "our author declines renewing the subject relative to Christ's declaration 'lo I am with you always even to the end of the world' which however we are not aware he has ever yet discussed." The fact is in examining Matthew XVIII .20. "For where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them" which the Editor quoted to establish the ubiquity of the Son, I enquired in my Second Appeal "Is it not evident that the Saviour meant here, by being in the midst of two or three of his disciples, his guidance to them, when joined together in searching for the truth? We find similar expressions in the scriptures wherein the guidance of the Prophets of God is also meant by words that would imply their pre-

sence." Luke XVI. 29. 'Abraham said unto him, they have Moses and the Prophes, let them hear them' and upon the Editor's quoting Matthew XXVIII 20. "I am with you always even to the end of the world" in all probability to establish the ubiquity of Jesus, I said in my Second Appeal p. 55. "I will not renew the subject as it has been already discussed in examining the first position," having shewn there that by the presence of Christ and that of other Prophets that may be observed in any part of the Bible, their spiritual guidance should be understood. My readers therefore may judge whether or not the purport of the last mentioned verse is connected with the subject discussed in examining the first position. I entreat the Editor however to reflect on the last phrase of the verse in question i. e "always to the end of the world," which so far from evincing Christ's eternal existence, implies that his influence over his disciples extended only to the end of the world, when he shall be himself subject to the Father of the universe 1 Cor. XV. 28.

CHAPTER VI.

On the Holy Spirit and other subjects.

I expressed my surprise, in my Second Appeal p 83. at the Editor's having "noticed in so short and abrupt a manner the question of

the personality and deity of the Holy Ghost, although the Editor esteems the Son and the Spirit as equally distinct persons of the Godhead." I feel now still more surprised to observe that the Editor, in his present review also, has noticed, in the same brief manner, the personality of the Holy Ghost; as while he fills more than a hundred pages in support of the deity of the *second* person, he has not allowed even a single page to the question of the *third*. He, at the same time, overlooks almost all the arguments I have advanced against his feeble attempt to prove the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, from page 83 to 97, and in many other places of the Second Appeal. The Editor however first says, that "if he, in whom dwelt all truth, has declared him (the Holy Ghost in Matthew XXVIII, 19). to be as distinct in person and as worthy of worship and adoration as the Father and himself, no further evidence is needed either to his personality or Godhead." Had the Editor thought the quotation of a single verse a sufficient excuse for avoiding the discussion of the personality of the Holy Ghost, he might have, on the same ground, omitted to discuss the subject of the deity of Jesus Christ, by noticing in like manner a single verse of Scripture, which he considered as a proof of the divine nature of the Son, and thus

saved me the trouble of a long controversy. If the association of names in a religious rite were to be admitted as a proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit, the Power of God, another divine attribute, should be considered God himself, it being also mentioned jointly with the Holy Spirit in the rite of Unction (Acts X. 38); and Fire also should he supposed to be a distinct person of the Godhead, because we find Fire associated with the Holy Ghost in the same rite of baptism as I before observed (Luke III. 16). but I shall not recur to this subject, having fully examined it in p. 349 & 350.

Notwithstanding my plain declaration, in the Second Appeal p. 95, that "with respect to the Holy Ghost, I must confess my inability to find *a single passage* in the whole Scriptures, in which the spirit is addressed as God or as a person of God, so as to afford believers of the Trinity an excuse for their profession of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost," The Editor thought it advisable not to dwell on the subject and only observes, "were it needful indeed, a rich fulness of scripture proof could be adduced respecting the Holy Spirit, as well as the Son; but the selection of a few passages will be quite sufficient." These are as follows: The first are from the Gospel of St. John XIV. 13. 26 Ch. XVI. 8 and

11, and the last are from Act. Ch. X. 20. and XII. 2. The Editor here overlooks entirely what I stated in the Second Appeal on this very point; that is, if from the consideration of such expressions as "God will send the Holy Spirit," "the Holy Spirit will teach you," "the Holy Spirit will reprove the world," "the Holy Spirit will glorify me," the spirit be acknowledged a separate person of the deity, what would the Editor say of other attributes such as mercy, wrath, truth, &c. which are also in a similar manner personified in various instances? Psalm LVII. 3, "God shall *send forth* his Mercy and Truth." LXXXV. 10, "Mercy and Truth are *met* together; righteousness and peace have *kissed* each other." LXXXIX. 14. "Mercy and Truth shall go before thy face." XCIV. 18. "My foot slippeth, thy Mercy O Lord, held me up," "Thy Mercy O Lord, is in the heavens," "For there is wrath gone out from the Lord" (Num. XVI. 46.)

In the course of citing the above verses of John and Acts, the Editor quotes Acts V. 3. "why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Spirit," "Thou hast not lied unto men but unto God" whence he concludes that he that lieth to the Holy Spirit lieth to God, and consequently the Spirit is God. On this inference I

have already observed in my former Appeal, that any sin or blasphemy against one of the attributes of God is of course accounted a sin or blasphemy against God himself. But this admission amounts neither to a recognition of the self-existence of the attribute, nor of its identity with God." I then referred the Editor to Matthew X. 40. "He that receiveth you receiveth me" and now I beg his attention to I Cor. VIII, 12. "But when ye sin so against the brethren and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ." Do these passages identify or equalize the apostles, of Jesus with himself? Nothing but early acquired and long established prejudices can prevent any literary character from perceiving such a gross error. As to Acts X. 20, if the speaker be admitted, according to the Editor, as a seperate person, he must then be identified either with the spirit of Cornelius who had actually sent the three men mentioned in v. 19. as is evident from v. 8, or with the angel of God who ordered Cornelius to send them to Peter. (v. 5th) a conclusion which would not after all suit the purpose of the Editor. I intreat the Editor to take notice at least of some of my arguments against the personality of the Holy Spirit mentioned in Chapter VI. of the Second Appeal p. 87—90 or if he declines adventuring on this point of Theology, let him candidly reduce the supposed persons of the

Godhead from a Trinity to Duality, and this point being gained, I may then continue my efforts with renewed hope of reducing this Duality to the Everlasting and Indivisible Unity.

The Editor concludes his Essay with saying (p. 624) "The deity and the personality of the Son and the Holy Spirit being established, the doctrine of the Ever-blessed Trinity needs no further confirmation: it follows of course. We shall therefore close our testimonies from Scripture, by laying before our readers three passages, which bring the sacred Three fully into view. The first we select from Isaiah XLVIII. in which one is introduced who previously declares 'My hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, &c.—' and whom therefore we are at no loss to recognize. He however declares verse 16 'and now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me." Now supposing the person who declares himself in verse 16, to have been sent by the Lord God and his Spirit is one of the persons of the Godhead, whose hand hath laid the foundation of the earth according to the Editor; this admission would be so far advantageous to the cause of the Editor as respects the plurality of persons in the deity; but it would be totally fatal to his grand object, since it would substitute Isaiah as a divine person in the place of Jesus

Christ. Isaiah the Prophet is the grand speaker throughout the whole of his book; who dedares himself often to have been sent by God as a messenger to Israel. He often speaks abruptly in behalf of God, as if God were speaking himself in the course of his own discourse as, I noticed in p. 98 and sometimes again he suddenly introduces his own sentiments, while he is announcing the words of Jehovah, without making any distinction. I mention here only a few instances: Isaiah LXIII. 6. "I will tread down the people in mine anger and make them drunk in my fury, &c. and I will bring down their strength to the earth" (7): "*I will* mention the loving kindness of the Lord and the praises of the Lord according to all that the Lord hath bestowed on us." Does not the Prophet *introduce himself* in verse 7, most abruptly, while speaking himself in behalf of God in v. 6? Ch. L. 3. "I clothe the heavens with blackness and I make sackcloth their covering." (4) "The Lord God hath *given me* the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary, &c." Here the Prophet introduces himself in v. 4, in the same abrupt manner without intimation of any change of person.

I now cite the context of the very verse of Isaiah quoted by the Editor to enable my rea-

ders to judge how far "it brings the sacred three fully into view." (14) All ye (the inhabitants of Judah) assemble yourselves, and hear; who among them (Israel) hath declared these things? The Lord hath loved him (Cyrus* of Persia the conqueror of Babylon.) He (the Lord) will do *his pleasure on Babylon* and his arm shall be on the Chaldeans." (15) "I even I have spoken; yea, I have *called him* (Cyrus) I have brought him and he shall make his way prosperous." (16) "Come ye near unto me (says the Prophet) hear ye this, I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I (that is, from the first time of these events:) and now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me." 17. Expressions similar to the phrase. "From the time that it was, there am I" are often used by the Prophets. Vide Jeremiah I. 5. "And before thou comest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a Prophet unto the nations;" and so Isaiah XLIX. 1. No one I presume that ever read even with common attention the book of Isaiah,

* Isaiah XLIV. 7. And who, as I, *shall call* and shall declare it, &c. (28) "That saith of Cyrus, he is my shepherd and shall perform all my pleasure" XLVI. 11 "*Calling* a ravenous bird from the *east*, the man that *executeth my counsel* from a far country, yea I have spoken it, I will also *bring it* to pass, I have purposed it I will also do it."

(in which speakers are introduced without any distinction more frequently than in the other Scriptural Books,) would attempt to prove the Trinity or the deity of Jesus Christ, from the passage quoted by the Editor unless he is previously biassed by some human creed, and thereby absolutely prevented from comparing impartially one passage with the other.

The Editor perhaps means the personality and the deity of the Holy Spirit by the phrase "the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me,"* (verse 16) seemingly representing the Spirit of God as a co-operator with himself. He might in that case on the same ground endeavour to establish the personality and the deity of *Righteousness*, another attribute of the deity, as being represented with God as an agent in Isaiah LIX. "Therefore his arm brought salvation unto him and his Righteousness it sustained him;" and he might also attempt to prove the personality and deity of the breath of God which is in like manner represented as a co-operator with the Spirit of God "Job XXXIII. 4. The Spirit of

* In the original Heb. the last phrase stands thus :— The Lord Jehovah hath sent me and his Spirit" which bear two constructions; first "the Lord Jehovah hath sent me and hath sent his Spirit" The second is, "the Lord Jehovah and his Spirit hath sent me."

God hath made me and the breath of him hath given life." Is this the best of the proofs of the Trinity with which the Editor closes his testimonies? If such be his proofs, I am at a loss to guess what his illustrations will be. The second passage quoted by the Editor is what I have just examined in p. 348-352 The third is 2 Cor. XIII. 14. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all. Amen." Here the apostle prays that the guidance of Jesus Christ, the love of God and the constant operation of the holy influence of God may be with Christians, since without the guidance of Jesus no one can be thoroughly impressed with the love of the deity under the christian dispensation, nor can that love of God continue to exist unless preserved by divine influence. A fact which I have demonstrated page 354-356 in examining Matthew XXVIII. 19. But what has this passage to do with the proof of the deity of Jesus and the personality of the Holy Spirit? Does not Paul call the Phillipians partakers of *his own* grace. Phil. I. 17? Is not every man pure in heart declared to be possessed of the grace of his lips; that is, verbal instructions? Pro. XXII. 11. Is not in Psalm XXIII. 6. the communion of goodness and mercy desired for all the days of life? Can such expressions be also considered

as proofs of the deity of Paul or of the personality of these attributes? I hope and pray the Editor may take all those circumstances into his serious consideration.

I now examine the remaining few of those passages, which I intended to notice in a subsequent Chapter of this Essay. The first is Zechariah XII. 10. "In that day they shall look upon me whom they have pierced" compared with John XIX. 37. "They shall look on him whom they pierced," To shew the error in the translation of the verse in the English version, I quoted in my Second Appeal the verse in the original Hebrew and a translation hereof from the Arabic Bible, and another from the Septuagint, with a literal English translation; which I repeat "and they shall look toward me on account of him whom they have pierced." But in order to destroy the validity of the Arabic Bible and that of the Septuagint, the Editor says that "the Greek and Arabic versions are nothing to the original text itself." I perfectly agree with him in this assertion, but I am convinced that the Editor must be better acquainted than myself with the prevailing and continued practice among Christian theologians to have recourse to the versions especially to the Septuagint, when a dispute arises in the interpretation

of any text of the Old Testament and to give preference to the authority of the Septuagint, even over that of Jerome's, which the Editor quotes in opposition to the Arabic and Greek versions.

As to the original text, the Editor first observes that "as to the particle אֵת eth which the best Hebrew Grammars define a particle marking the accusative case governed by active verbs, or an emphatic particle denoting the very thing itself." I therefore think it proper to quote Parkhurst's opinion on the particle אֵת eth from his Hebrew Lexicon, that my readers may judge whether or not the above rule laid down by the Editor is founded upon good authority. Parkhurst (p. 48) "The Lexicons say, that when joined with a verb, it (eth) denotes the accusative case, if the verb be *active;* see Genesis I. 1. and al. freq. but the *nominative* if the verb be passive or *neuter*. Genesis XXVII. 45, Deut. XX. 8, Josh. VII. 15, &c. al. freq. But in truth it is the sign of no particular case, that *distinction* being *unknown* in *Hebrew*. See Josh. XXII. 17, Ezek. XXXV. 10. Num. X. 2, I Sam. XVII. 34. 2 Sam. XV, 23. Neh IX 19. 34. 2 Kings VI. 5." Parkhurst gives also the second meaning of this particle.— "2, *with, to, towards*, Exodus I. 1. Deut. VII. 8," which the Editor also partially admits.

The fact is, this particle denotes an accusative case as well as other cases and also stands for the English prepositions "with," "for," "towards," &c. and therefore the verse in question as it is found in our Hebrew copies of the Old Testament, should indisputably be thus read in consistence with its context; 31 "And they shall look towards me for, (or on account of) him whom they have pierced" or "they shall look upon me with him whom they have pierced."*

The Editor quotes, to my great surprize, (in p. 546) some verses in which the particle את requires an accusative case and consequently no preposition "for," "to," or "with," can be properly placed. But I beg to ask the

* Newcome reads "and they shall look on him whom they pierced" His note on this translation is as follows: "on him] Thirty-six MSS. and two ed. read אליו: three other MSS read so originally; six perhaps read so; six read so now; and eleven have אליו in the margin, as Keri. And yet אלי *on me*, may be traced in the ancient versions and Chald. אליו was also noted as a various lection by R. Saadias, who lived about the year 900. See Kenn. diss. gen. §. 43. "Citant אליו Talmud et R. Saadias Haggaion. Poc. Append, in Mal." Secker. Dr. Owen shews that Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Barnabas favour the reading of אליו Inquiry—Sept. version Sect. IV."

Editor how he can turn the following verses to his purpose, wherein no accusative case after the particle את can be at all admitted. Exodus I. 1. "Now these are the names of the children of Israel; which came into Egypt; every man and his household came *with* Jacob." Would the Editor thus render the particle here requiring an accusative case,—"every man and his household came Jacob?" Would the verse in this case bear any sense? Genesis XLIV. 4 הם יצאו את העיר "They were gone *out* of the city." There the particle stands for "out of" or "from." IV 1 "I have gotten a man *from* the Lord." Here the preposition "from" is substituted for this very Heb. particle. In Deut. VII. 8, we have "כי מאהבת יהוה אתכם" terally "on account of the love of God for you" though thus rendered in the English version, "Because the Lord loved you."*

In the course of examining this subject, the Editor quotes, "Thy throne, O Jehovah, is for ever and ever." I shall feel obliged, if he will kindly let me know from what book of the Old or New Testament he has selected this verse,

* Archbishop Secker in Newcome has the following remark "Potest את אשר notare *eo quòd*, ut vertunt ὁ Ch. vel *quem*. ך Vid. Nold. Et sic post Dativum adhibetur Jer. XXXVIII 9."

containing the term, "Jehovah" in the first part of the text.

As to my remarks on Zechariah XIII. 7, "Awake O sword, against my shepherd and against the man that is my fellow, saith Jehovah of Hosts; smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered," the Editor agrees partly with me, saying, "No one doubts that the Saviour placed himself in subjection to the Father, when he condescended to become subject to death." He however wishes to prove the deity of Jesus Christ by the application of the word *fellow* (עמית) to him. He here quotes Micah "whose goings forth were from everlasting" and John, "And the word was with God" which have no relation to the term עמית or *fellow* found in the verse in question; and as these quotations of the Editor have been examined in p. 265 & 291 I shall not recur to them in this place. He lastly quotes Parkhurst to shew that עמית "implies a neighbour, a member of the same society." Is not this quotation, defining the Hebrew word עמית as "a neighbour," directly against the object of the Editor? If Christ is represented either in a real or figurative sense as standing on the *right hand* of the deity, taking precedence of all those that believe in him as the promised Messiah sent from God, would it be

inconsistent in itself or an acknowledgment of his deity to use the word עמית or neighbour for Christ? My readers will observe from the following quotations that this very term עמית which is rendered *fellow* in the verse in question, is translated "neighbour" by the very authors of the English version in many other instances. Leviticus VI. 2, "or hath deceived his *neighbour*." The last word is a translation of the term עמית: XIX. 17. "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy "*neighbour*" or *gnmeeth* : Ch. XXV. 14 and 15.

The Editor, in speaking of Christ, repeats now and then the phrase, "God blessed for ever" perhaps alluding to Romans IX. 5.—Among all the interpretations given to this text, for or against the Trinity, there is the Paraphrase of Locke of whose name the literary world is so justly proud, which I here first quote.—"Had the patriarchs, to whom the promises were made, for their (the Israelites,) forefathers; and of them, as to his fleshly* extraction, Christ is come, he who is over all, God be blessed forever, Amen." Secondly I shall cite here some scriptural passages to shew that it was customary with Jewish writers to address abrupt exclamations to God,

Vide v the 3rd of the same Chapter in which Paul speaks of his "kinsmen according to the flesh."

while treating of some other subjects, that my readers may be convinced that the sudden introduction of the phrase, "God be blessed for ever," in v. 5 by St. Paul, was perfectly consistent with the style of the sacred writings: Psalm LXXXIX. 51. 52. "wherewith thine enemies have reproached, O Lord, wherewith they have reproached the footsteps of thine anointed; *blessed be the Lord forever more. Amen and Amen.*" CIV. 35. "Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more: *bless thou the Lord, O my soul. Praise ye the Lord.*"

If St. Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians and in that to the Ephesians, declares positively that the Father is the only Being who has the right to the epithet "*God*" under the Christian dispensation, he could not, as an inspired writer, be guilty of so palpable a contradiction as to apply this very epithet to the Christ of God on another occasion. I Cor. VIII. 6. "But to us (Christians) there is but *one God the Father,*" Ephe. I. 17 "That the God *of our Lord Jesus* Christ the *Father* of glory," &c. IV. 5 and 6 "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism: *One God and Father of all,* who is above all, through *all* and in us *all.*"

Respecting I John v. 20, I beg to refer to the rule laid down by Bishop Middleton (of

whom the Editor speaks highly and justly (in p. 535) in his work on the Greek article p. 79 "When two or more attributives joined by a copulative or copulatives are *assumed* of the same person or thing, before the first attributive the article is *inserted;* before the remaining ones it is omitted." In the passage under consideration there are two attributives joined by a copulative, and in order to ascertain whether they are assumed of the *same* person or of *different* persons, it is only necessary to observe that the article is inserted not only before the first attributive, but also before the second; and that consequently "the true God" is one person, and "the eternal life" is another. This perfectly corresponds with the preceding part of the verse in which "he that is true" and "his Son Jesus Christ" are separately mentioned.

Finding the practice of the primitive Christians during the first three centuries unfavourable to his sentiments, the Editor prudently keeps it out of view altogether, merely observing (p. 625) into that "we do not even inquire. Paul tells us that even in his time 'the mystery of iniquity' had already begun to work and John adds that 'many Antichrists' had already gone out into the world." The Editor must be well aware that those in whom the

mystery of iniquity was found, and who were detected as Antichrists were not in the fellowship of true Christians, and consequently Church Histories treat of the practice of the latter entirely distinct from that of the former; and it is therefore evident that the practice and professions of primitive Christians, who were generally the contemporaries of the apostles or their disciples, are worthy of inquiry for the regulation of the conduct of the Christians of these days.

As to Mosheim, the Editor says "even Mosheim, suspected as he is of being unfavourable to the truth, establishes their faith in Christ's deity in the very passage quoted p. 103 by our author against this doctrine." It appears from this quotation that they when baptized "made solemn profession of their confidence in Christ." The Jews as well as almost all the Gentiles professed their belief in God; but the thing which was required of them by the apostles was that, they should make profession of confidence in Jesus as the Christ of God in the rite of baptism. If such a profession of confidence in Christ is admitted by the Editor as a sufficient acknowledgment of his deity; why should he be so hostile to those (whom he styles Unitarians) who are baptized in the name of Jesus and also *profess* their solemn *confidence* in *him*? Still further

am I surprized that when the apostle John expressly wrote his gospel to prove "that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God," (Ch. XX. 31) the Editor, so far from being satisfied with those who receive Jesus in the character expressed by these terms ("the Christ the Son of God,") in the sense which they uniformly bear in the Scriptures, requires them moreover to believe, that Jesus Christ is the very and eternal God, and thus not only defeats the object of the apostle, but even contradicts him in express language.

The Editor then proceeds to say "respecting Locke and Newton, our reply is precisely the same; their opinions in divinity are nothing to us." The Editor elated by the general prevalence of the orthodox system, effected only by perversions of the sense of the divine writings, attempts to turn the authorities of these great men also to his own purpose. "If (says he) Locke, as our author affirms, (p. 161) really thought that the faith which makes men Christians includes their receiving Jesus Christ for their Lord and King; Locke knew that this included the belief of his omniscience and omnipresence, as without this, his being their King was only a solemn mockery." The Editor prudently quotes here only a part of the sentence of Locke quoted by me, which he

thought might give him an opportunity of making comments favourable to his creed, but it is fortunate for us that his works being written and printed in English, are not liable to much critical perversion. Locke says, "that the believing Jesus to be the Messiah includes in it a receiving him for our Lord and King PROMISED AND SENT FROM GOD." The phrase chosen by that celebrated author "*sent from God*" denies the deity of Christ beyond doubt, since one sent by another is of course different from him who sends him. To avoid every misconstruction being thrown upon his definition, Locke chose the term "God" instead of any other term in the above phrase, that Jesus might be understood separately from God without the least room for the sophistry that might represent him as God the Son sent from God the Father. We however are not at a loss to discover what Locke meant by the terms "Lord and King" when referred to Jesus, as he fully explained them in his Paraphrase on the epistles to the Corinthians. As to the term "*Lord*" I refer to the note on verse the 2nd of Ch. I. of I. Cor. "what the apostle means by *Lord*, when he attributes it to Christ vide VIII. 6." Paraphrase on VIII. 6. "yet to us Christians there is but *one God, the Father and author of all things* to whom *alone* we address *all* our worship and service;

and one Lord viz. Jesus Christ by whom all things come *from* God *to us* and by whom we have access to the Father." As to the term King I quote his Paraphrase on Ch. XV. v. 24. which clearly represents his sovereignty as *finite* "after that shall be the day of judgement, which shall bring to a conclusion and finish the whole dispensation to the race and posterity of Adam, in this world: when Christ shall have *delivered up the kingdom to God the Father* which he shall not do till he hath destroyed all empire, power, and authority that shall be in the world besides."

The Editor says of Sir Isaac Newton, "His belief of Christ's deity appears as clear as the light, from our author's own quotation; when he said that Christians of all ages are represented as worshipping God and the Lamb." Newton was too circumspect to leave his word liable to perversion by the popular opinion. He explains the sense in which Christians worship God and also the sense in which they worship Jesus, the one as directly opposed to the other as the West to the East. Newton says "God for his benefaction in *creating all things*, and the Lamb for his benefaction in *redeeming* with his blood; God as sitting upon the throne and living *for ever*, and the Lamb exalted above all

by the merits of his death." The worship offered to the latter is therefore merely a manifestation of civil reverence as I pointed out in p. 342.

To equalize a being exalted and worshipped for his meritorious *death* with the eternal Supreme Sovereign of the universe is only an attempt to bring the nature of the deity on a level with a mortal creature and by no means serves to elevate that creature, to the rank of the deity. If the Editor consider these quotations from Locke and Newton really orthodox, how inconsistent he must be in condemning those whose sentiments as to the person of Jesus Christ are precisely the same; to wit, that he is the anointed Lord and King promised and sent from God, is worthy of worship for his mediation and meretorious death, but by no means as a being possessed of a two-fold nature, divine and human, perfect God and perfect Man.

As to my remarks on certain abstruse reasonings resorted to by the orthodox, the Editor further says, that he needs them not; thereby avowedly relinquishing reason in support of the Trinity, but happily he asserts at the same time that "to us the scriptures are sufficient." I therefore entreat him to point out a single scriptural authority, treating of a compound God of

three persons, and of a compound Messiah, one of these three persons, constituted of a two fold nature, divine and human.

The Editor alludes to the term "Antichrists" found in the epistle of John; but I am glad that we most fortunately are furnished with the definition of this term by that inspired writer, which decides at once the question who are the real subjects of its application. 1. John IV. 3. "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God and this is that Spirit of Antichrist." We accordingly rejoice to confess that Jesus Christ, who came in the flesh is OF GOD and that not only he, but his apostles also were of God, (I. John IV. 6. V. 19.) But we feel sincerely for those who violate this standard, either by falling short or going beyond it, by denying that Jesus Christ is OF GOD, or by affirming that Jesus Christ is God himself; since both these assertions, to wit, "Jesus Christ is NOT of God" and "Jesus Christ IS God" are equally incompatible with John's proposition that "Jesus Christ is OF GOD." For example. The Prime minister by the law of the land is appointed by the King, and consequently is acknowledged to be OF THE KING, to say therefore that he is not of the king would be to detract from the minister's dignity; but to say

that the prime minister is the King is not only inconsistent with the assertion that the prime minister is of the King; but would be pronounced high treason, in like manner as deifying the Christ of God is both an affront to God, and an *Antichristian* doctrine.

Lastly, I tender my humble thanks for the Editor's kind suggestion, in inviting me to adopt the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; but I am sorry to find that I am unable to benefit by this advice. After I have long relinquished every idea of a plurality of Gods or of the persons of the Godhead, taught under different systems of modern Hindooism, I cannot conscientiously and consistently embrace one of a similar nature, though greatly refined by the religious reformations of modern times; since whatever arguments can be adduced against a plurality of Gods strike with equal force against the doctrine of a plurality of persons of the Godhead; and on the other hand whatever excuse may be pleaded in favor of a plurality of persons of the deity, can be offered with equal propriety in defence of Polytheism.

I now conclude my Essay by offering up thanks to the Supreme disposer of the events of this universe, for having unexpectedly delivered

this country from the long continued tyrrany of its former Rulers, and placed it under the Government of the English, a Nation who not only are blessed with the enjoyment of civil and political liberty but also interest themselves in promoting liberty and social happiness, as well as free inquiry into literary and religious subjects, among those nations to which their influence extends.

FINIS.

Date Due

FEB 9			
JAN 16 '88			
JAN 31			
DEC 7			
MAR 10			
MAY 25			

Demco 293-5

Duke University Libraries
D01356032K

D01356032K
DUKE LSC